DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 025 243 JC 680 474

Conference Report on the Annual Conference of the New York State Association of Junior Colleges (21st, Niagara Falls, April 26-27, 1968).

New York State Association of Junior Colleges.

Pub Date 68

Note-80p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.10

Descriptors-*Community Services, Conferences, *Faculty, *Governance, *Junior Colleges, *Teachers

Identifiers-*New York

This report examines four areas of faculty involvement in junior college activities. (1) In college governance, faculties are told to (a) look to self-government first and then, if necessary, turn to outside organizations, (b) seek a "golden mean" between communalism and instrumentalism, and (c) seek mutual equality, trust, and respect with administrators. (2) In student counseling, faculties are advised to (a) provide for a closer integration of the student and the educational program, (b) develop counseling techniques of their own, and (c) follow-up with students but try not to play God. (3) In community services, faculties are told to (a) recognize their power and participate meaningfully, (b) develop interinstitutional cooperation, (c) work with existing groups in the community, (d) explore areas of need in the community, (e) join civic, religious or political organizations, (f) provide a counseling service for the community as well as a consulting service for local industry, and (g) live up to the name, "community college." (4) In the educational process, faculties are advised to (a) create new flexibility for social science instruction in technical education, (b) structure curriculum and methods to meet student and community needs rather than textbook or teacher needs, (c) avoid the lecture syndrome and "cookbook" techniques in instruction, (d) offer sound programs of continuing education, and (e) construct curricula to allow for the inevitable changes in the complexion of our technological society. (RM)

1968

Conference Report

OF THE

Twenty-First Annual Conference

ED025243

JC 680 474

NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION
OF JUNIOR COLLEGES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Twenty-First Annual Conference

NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION
OF JUNIOR COLLEGES

ED025243

Theme . . .

"Today's Education For Tomorrow"

THE PARKWAY INN
Niagara Falls, New York

April 26-27, 1968

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PROGRAM - - - - - - - - - - - - - - IV-V

OFFICERS - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - VI

EDITOR'S REMARKS - - - - - - - - - - - - VII

KEYNOTE ADDRESS — Dr. Shoben - - - - - - - 1

BANQUET ADDRESS — Dr. Kirkbride - - - - - - 7

LUNCHEON ADDRESS — Mr. Eldridge - - - - - - 11

PANEL I - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 17

PANEL II - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 35

PANEL III - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 44

PANEL IV - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 55

OVER THE YEARS - - - - - - - - - - - - 68

CONSTITUTION OF NEW YORK
STATE ASSOCIATION OF JUNIOR COLLEGES - - 71

PANEL I Pg. 17

"FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN COLLEGE GOVERNANCE AND POLICY MAKING"

MODERATOR: Walter E. Reichelt *(Adirondack)*
ASSISTANT MODERATOR: Dr. Robert T. Giuffrida *(Corning)*
RECORDER: Arthur L. Galub *(Bronx)*
ASSISTANT RECORDER: John W. Lavery *(Finger Lakes)*
PANELISTS: Charles E. Bennett *(Cazenovia)*
Israel Glasser *(New York City)*
Rudolph A. Lawton *(National Education Assoc.)*
Miss Catherine A. Noyes *(Fashion Institute of Technology)*
Gene Welborn, *President (American Federation of Teachers at SUNY College, Buffalo)*

PANEL II Pg. 35

"FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN STUDENT COUNSELING"
MODERATOR: Miss Vera F. Minkin *(Bronx)*
ASSISTANT MODERATOR: Jack C. Van Newkirk *(Ulster County)*
RECORDER: John W. Kelley *(Corning)*
ASSISTANT RECORDER: Carl H. Mitlehner *(Farmingdale)*
PANELISTS: Dr. Jearl L. Blankenship *(Alfred)*
Max B. Franc *(Borough of Manhattan)*
John C. Graf *(Staten Island)*
Charles A. Schenck *(Ulster County)*

PANEL III Pg. 44

"FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN COLLEGE AND COMMUNITY SERVICES"
MODERATOR: Dr. Malcolm H. Forbes *(Cazenovia)*
ASSISTANT MODERATOR: Peter J. Caffrey *(Bronx)*
RECORDER: Paul A. Chambers *(Broome Technical)*
ASSISTANT RECORDER: Ada C. Cataldo *(Staten Island)*
PANELISTS: Frank A. Cipriani *(Farmingdale)*
Mrs. Dom Laurie *(Niagara County)*
Victor Lauter *(New York City)*

PANEL IV Pg. 55

"FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATIONAL PROCESSES"
MODERATOR: Dr. Joseph Seidlin *(Alfred)*
ASSISTANT MODERATOR: Sister Mary Aloise Anne, CSSF *(Villa Maria College)*
RECORDER: Dr. H. David Trautlein *(Herkimer County)*
PANELISTS: Richard A. Cobb *(Onondaga)*
Frank S. DiStefano *(Broome Technical)*
Wayne E. Schlifke *(Erie County)*
Alfred V. Sloan, Jr. *(Fashion Institute of Technology)*

PROGRAM

Friday, April 26, 1968

10:30 A.M.	**BRIEFING SESSION** Moderators and Panel Personnel Ballroom, Second Floor
12:00 to 2:00 P.M.	**REGISTRATION** Convention Center Lobby
2:30 to 3:30 P.M.	**GENERAL SESSION** Ballroom, Second Floor

PRESIDING
Dr. Marvin A. Rapp, *President*
New York State Association of Junior Colleges

ADDRESS
"Academic Community or Nest of Adversaries?"
Dr. Edward J. Shoben, Jr., *Director*
Commission on Academic Affairs,
American Council on Education

3:30 to 3:45 P.M.	**COFFEE** Hospitality Room, Second Floor
3:45 to 5:00 P.M.	**PANEL MEETINGS**
5:30 to 6:30 P.M.	**RECEPTION** Reception Room, Second Floor
7:00 P.M.	**ANNUAL BANQUET** Ballroom, Second Floor

PRESIDING
Dr. Marvin A. Rapp

ADDRESS
"Responsibilities of Leadership"
Dr. Virginia Kirkbride
Professor of Psychology
George Washington University

PROGRAM

Saturday, April 27, 1968

7:00 to BREAKFAST
8:45 A.M. Special Interest Groups
Parkway Room and Press Room

9:00 to NYSAJC ANNUAL
10:00 A.M. BUSINESS MEETING
Regal Room, First Floor

PRESIDING
Dr. Marvin A. Rapp

10:15 to PANEL MEETINGS
12:00 Noon Panel I — Regal Room
Panel II — Imperial Room
Panel III -- Directors' Room
Panel IV — Executive Room

12:30 P.M. ANNUAL LUNCHEON
Imperial Suite

PRESIDING
Dr. Marvin A. Rapp

ADDRESS
"What's Ahead For Junior Colleges?"
Donald A. Eldridge, *President*
Bennett College

2:30 P.M. TOURS

NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OF JUNIOR COLLEGES

President - - - - - - - - - Dr. Marvin A. Rapp
President, Onondaga Community College

Vice President - - - - - - Dr. Norma E. Bentley
Cazenovia College

Secretary-Treasurer - - - - - - Dr. David H. Huntington
SUNY College at Alfred

Past President - - - - - - - - Dr. LeRoy V. Good
President, Monroe Community College

Executive Secretary - - - - - - Elbridge M. Smith
SUNY College at Cobleskill

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

1966-1968

MISS ADELE LOYSEN
Bennett College, Millbrook
DR. BENJAMIN ROWE
New York City Community College
MANUEL STILLERMAN
Bronx Community College
DR. NORVIN T. WHITMORE
Erie County Technical Institute

1967-1969

DR. ALBERT W. BAISLER
Jamestown Community College
DR. B. FRANK FULLER, JR.
Fashion Institute of Technology
SISTER ANNE MARIE
Trocaire College
HARVEY N. ROEHL
Broome Technical Community College
GRAY M. TWOMBLY
Paul Smith's College

CONFERENCE ARRANGEMENTS COMMITTEE

SISTER ANNE MARIE
Trocaire College
DR. NORVIN T. WHITMORE
Erie County Technical Institute
JAMES D. PLETCHER
Niagara County Community College
NORMAN P. SHEA
Niagara County Community College

EDITOR 1968 CONFERENCE REPORT
CHARLES J. SANTELLI

EDITOR'S REMARKS—

The NYSAJC expresses its sincere appreciation to the members of the host colleges — Trocaire College, Erie County Technical Institute and Niagara County Community College — who helped to make the Twenty-first Annual Conference a success.

Special recognition must be given to Dr. Marvin A. Rapp and Dr. Norma E. Bentley for their contributions to the Conference.

I want to express my gratitude to all the panel participants for making my job so much easier.

FROM DISSENT TO RESISTANCE: SOME THOUGHTS ON THE DECAY OF MORALS

EDWARD JOSEPH SHOBEN, JR..
American Council on Education
Washington, D.C.

For nearly 200 years, a strongly shared set of values has shaped and given direction to the American dream. Largely inherited from the European enlightenment and the traditions of western liberalism, those values have been essentially the ones identified by Max Weber in his classic analysis of the Protestant ethic. At the core have been work, achievement, and security; playing more instrumental roles, self-control, an orientation toward the future, the supremacy of rationality over the impulses and emotions, and the potentially supportive and protective approval of society have all been vitally important. As the United States has grown, this central value-structure has provided room and reinforcement for individuality through frontier - related opportunities and through an enlarging multiplicity of forms, primarily occupational, over which the basic ethic could be effectively stretched.

Currently, the nation is subject to a panoply of forces that challenge that ancient pattern of dominant values. Among these powerful influences are the tempo and massiveness of contemporary social change, the technology of communication and its interaction with a highly literate population, the human crowding that results from population growth and urbanization, and the transformation of the economy from an industrial to what has been called a post-industrial base. 1) It is within this context that one can grasp some of the significance of student unrest and the dissidence of youth. What is crucial about these phenomena is not their greying of administrative heads or their interference with large-scale institutional machinery. Their importance lies, rather, in their strong suggestion of a sharp decline in the potency of traditional values to guide and animate American life.

Born to a time of jet travel and television, with little sense of either the Great Depression or the war against Hitler as much less remote than the Black Plague or the Thirty Years War, and aware from infancy of the near-genocidal weaponry that ironically defines modern man's most creative achievement, today's youth are, in the main, indeed, children of both affluence and anxiety. They are a part of what is most novel in our rapidly and radically changing age; and what is now most novel is what is least familiar to those with longer memories and more antique arteries.

It follows, then, that if there has always been a "generational gap" of some kind or other, the conditions for the gap's widening are presently particularly acute, and the magnitude of that gulf is lent special meaning by population projections. Almost half the American people are currently under 25 years of age. By 1972, a majority will be under 21, and the median age of the American voter in that year should be about 26. Beyond their increase in numbers, youth have attained a kind of solidarity by virtue of college attendance. Now enrolled in excess of six million on campuses across the country, students have been recognized as something roughly analogous to a social class. Selective Service deals with them on special terms; advertising identifies them as a distinctive and important "target public"; they are courted politically, and their modes are acknowledged, sometimes with acceptance and sometimes with retributive outrage, as different from those of older generations.

Numbers and a kind of corporate

identity imply potential power. For potential power to become manifest, spokesmen are needed to give leadership and focus to size and membership; and spokesmen are now available among student activists who, even though they represent a minority of youth, still compose a considerable group. If only 3 percent of current college students can be called activists, they yet number in excess of 180,000, and they appear, in one way or another, to voice the sentiments of from one-fifth to one-third of their less directly involved peers.

Both intrinsically, therefore, and *as the heirs apparent of American destiny, contemporary college students can hardly be ignored. And whatever one may say — and a good deal of importance can be said — about their style and manner, their primary concerns hardly merit neglect among thoughtful and goodwilled men.* In a complex fashion, four major themes have underlain student unrest as we have known it since 1960. One is civil justice. A second is the humanization and personalization of international relations, expressed basically in vigorous opposition to the American posture in Vietnam and in the endorsement of such person-to-person ventures as the Peace Corps. The third is the modernization of the university and its relationship to society. And the fourth, cutting across the other three, is an emphasis on individual freedom and self-determination, on the existential primacy of the present and of experience in contrast to the traditional dominance of the future or of either authority or the accumulated wisdom associated with guiding conventions. In pressing for a hearing in the prosecution of these broad and humane interests, students have typically assumed a stance that is political and tactical, but their energizing convictions have been profoundly moral. Active and often risky involvement in the fight for civil rights, in opposition to the war in southeast Asia, and in battles for educational reform grow basically out of beliefs about the right way a man should live and commitments to the principle that individuals must contribute actively to the attainment of a more generous and decent world. Indeed, these involvements primarily reflect the social implementation of the ethic of individual freedom in the existential present: At their richest, freedom and the authenticity of experience must be widely shared. Civil justice, peace, and more relevant forms of educational opportunity are, on the one hand, the conditions under which such a sharing can be most significantly achieved and enjoyed; on the other hand, the vigorous pursuit of these social goals makes possible the experience of meaningfulness and freedom that is the touchstone of the moral life.

Such an experiential and existential touchstone contrasts sharply with the traditional moral criterion of how well behavior accords with conventions or time-established rules. It has little to do with work and earned security as our civilization has enshrined them, and it often flies in the face of prudent self-control or cultivation of social approval. When applied to such affairs as sexual conduct, the use of marijuana, and personal appearance, the existential test can too readily be misunderstood as a legitimizing of license, an escape from the harsh realities that a truly moral man faces, and an unsocialized sloppiness. Although the way of wisdom with respect to sex, drugs, and dress is more than merely moot, and although one need not be at all convinced that the advocates of the New Left or of the hippie mode are within gunshot of newly persuasive and genuinely humane insights, the basic issues here are very different. They concern such matters as the right of privacy in an era when that right is subject to subtle but enormous and debilitating erosion. They concern the question of the extent to which pharmacological agents can be employed for the improvement of the human condition and for the enlargement of personal experience in a time when psychoactive drugs have become commonplace in the adult community — witness the huge annual bills paid for caffeine, nicotine, alcohol, and a startling variety of tranquilizers by the most stable and conventionally contributive members of our middle class. They concern the question of the degree to which contemporary life has come to focus on traditional forms and the externals of social interchange as against the experience of pleasure and the real substance of personal relationships. Such matters have always been of moment to civilized men, and history has consistently recorded the indebtedness of cultures to those who, by searching out the elements of hypocrisy and decadence and self-delusion in them, have helped to revitalize them.

But the thoroughly appropriate debates that can be held about the specific positions of activist students on particular problems is not our business here. The present thesis is a twofold one: First, the confrontation that has been shaping up between the student sector and traditional society is an authentically moral one, fundmental and serious in tone and implications, generative of a healthy rethinking of ethical ideas and the ways in which they can be made manifest in social policy, and a decided aid in helping America gear itself to the pace and pattern of the changes that are the hallmark of the age. Second, insofar as it has accepted the slogan of "from dissent to resistance," the moral force of students activism has become corrupt and subject to decay.

It is not that the escalation of criticism and protest to disobedience and disruption is hard to understand. In many instances, youth have found it difficult to obtain more than a *pro forma* hearing for their grievances and their recommendations in the corridors of institutional or national power. A highly relevant illustration is the lack of response to the two very moderate letters on Vietnam and the draft addressed to the White House at Christmas time in 1966 and in June of 1967 by the student body presidents of 200 extremely varied colleges and universities. *Conscious of their numbers and their college-based corporate solidarity, informed and concerned students are unlikely to be put off for very long by silence, a figurative pat on the head, or mere access to a patient but inattentive ear of authority.* The point holds in spite of the discourtesy, disrespect, and deliberately provocative style of which students have frequently been guilty in their search for a proper forum in which to make their case. Youthful bad manners have often been not only tactically stupid; they have contravened the argument for increased humanization that has been the main and most convincing tenet in their pressure for reform in both the university and the larger society. Nevertheless, their sins have sometimes been less objectionable — on the grounds, by the way, of quite traditional concepts of civility and wisdom — than the neglectful, patronizing, or intransigent reaction from responsible and established seats of power.

If, however, this state of affairs helps to explain, it in no way justifies the move from dissent to resistance, from a vigorous competition among moral ideas and ethical models to a clash in which raw might is the only determiner of the outcome. Almost by definition, this shift in the character of the confrontation removes it from the moral domain. When contending parties attempt to settle their differences by weapons alone, one side always considers the other without legitimacy, unredeemable in its villainy, and inaccessible to either reason or moral suasion. It is for this reason that war is so typically callousing to the human spirit. Because of the tragic imperfections that so integrally mark man's condition, resorts to warfare may be unhappily comprehensible, but they give no warrant to anyone to engage in organized violence in the name of an unsullied morality.

Clarifying this position in the context of today's student unrest requires an examination of the notion of civil disobedience with respect both to violating the law and the deliberate breaking of institutional rules. The flaunting of duly adopted social regulations is dangerous, of course, on two scores: On the one hand, it rends the fabric of community, opening the doors to anarchy and disorder. On the other hand, because, despite some unconscionable exceptions, the basic reason for laws in the traditions of the West is to protect society against the tyranny of men, civil disobedience always carries with it the risk of the rise to power of a charismatic dictator or an authoritarian junta; the restoration of social stability and the achievement of some regularity in the community's necessary operations have often provided the road over which a Fuhrer has traveled to prominence. At the same time, experience suggests certain circumstances under which the systematic and planned violation of social rules may be looked upon as acceptable, justified, and beneficial:

(1) The existence of a societal state of affairs so inhumane and indefensible as to demand extreme corrective measures. This condition is adequately fulfilled only when (a) no mode of appropriate redress is available through law or the usual political machinery and (b) the moral or political principles by which the existing state of affairs is judged intolerable are articulate, explicitly formulated, and supported on behalf of the *total* community.

(2) Techniques of civil disobedience that entail minimal or no risk of injury to others.

(3) Minimal or no infringement of the legal rights of others, including those against whose interests the disobedience is aimed.

(4) The avoidance of violence.

(5) The acceptance of the consequences of civil disobedience. By definition, civil disobedience involves not oppostition to law but the breaking of a particular and offensive law in support of a "higher" moral or social principle. Attempts, when disobedience fails, to escape the penalties imply both that no offensive law has been broken and that the higher principle is not worth the sacrifice.

(6) Clear support of the justifying principle by a substantial minority of the population affected by the rules attacked. Because the violation of regulations is a community affair, it cannot properly and on principle be acted out unless both the basic grievances and the justifying principle have a base in significant community endorsement.

(7) Some reasonable probability that disobedience will achieve a remedy to the ill that initiated it.

Unless these conditions are met, it seems clear that civil disobedience can readily degenerate into indiscriminate rioting, a technique for serving selfish interests, and a route to one brand or another of fascism. Despite the strength of the instigations and the desperation that may lie at the roots of civil resistance, the resistance movement itself is likely to prove self-defeating in such a case. Social action not infrequently has consequences unforeseen by those committed to it, and totalitarian outcomes are rarely the aim of this kind of disobedience. In any event, without full regard for the justifying circumstances, civil disobedience can lose its moral base and slide rapidly into mob violence, the venting of miscellaneous frustrations, and the ugly expression of a variety of doubtfully relevant hostilities.

In any context, then, a progression from dissent and protest to resistance and disobedience must prove its moral validity by adherence to the conditions set out here. In a university, this kind of proof is particularly difficult to attain. Among its central functions, the university must give a high place to serving as a forum for the exploration and debating of significant ideas. The processes of exploration and debate can be abridged or stifled in many ways, and this kind of interference is no less objectionable when students are responsible than when a legislature or an administrative officer is at fault. To provide a meaningful forum, a college campus must be thoroughly open, 2) offering hospitality to speakers who attempt to recruit minds and to officials from government and business who attempt to recruit talents. To demonstrate, then, against the ideas and practices that an agent of the Department of Defense or the Dow Chemical Company may represent is quite legitimate; to capture him, to prevent his doing his lawful job, and to interfere with access to him on the part of other possibly interested students are activities having too much in common with a ban on speakers, the censorship of the college newspaper, or restrictions on the circulation of "dangerous" library books. In all these instances, a fundamental purpose of the university is subverted, and the morality of the subversion is hard to find and harder still to justify.

There is another ground on which the dissent-to-resistance notions seems questionable. Any morality, including an ethic of immediate experience, gives some attention to the consequences of acts and to the future entailments of conduct. In the case of contemporary student activism — particularly those aspects of it concerned with Black Power, nihilistic efforts to overthrow the entire educational and social system, and some of the most extreme protestations against the war in Vietnam — it seems probable that the advocates of disobedience are breeding a back-lash that could make the McCarthyism of the early 1950's seem tame and generous. John Fischer 3) has recently pointed out this very real danger:

> . . . some members of the New Left . . . have openly proclaimed their allegiance to Mao or Castro . . . and their hopes of destroying or at least "dislocating" American society. Others have engaged in what now can be excused as idealistic gestures — burning draft cards, assaults on induction centers, blocking of troop trains, mobbing Cabinet officers. Tomorrow, in the hot glare of a Senate investigating chamber, a skillful demagogue could easily make such behavior look like giving aid and comfort to the enemy.
>
> Moreover, the New Leftists are busily undermining their own best defense: the American traditions of free speech and tolerance. Increasingly, they are taking the position: "I'm right. You are wrong. Therefore I cannot permit you to be heard." So, in the name of morality, they are stoning and howling down anyone who might disagree with them . . .
>
> The saddest prospect is that the coming reaction will fall not only on these (New Leftists) but also on . . . a good many students of the kind described by Nan Robertson of the *New York Times* as "intellectual hobbits — warm, lovable, and a little furry-minded." Among them, too . . . will be people like Mr. Rovere and my-

> self, who still believe in the old-fashioned virtues of free speech and fair trial — and who will feel compelled, therefore, to oppose the new crop of witch-hunters as we opposed McCarthy . . .

Unless there is evidence of some appropriate concern for this disturbing possibility, it seems only accurate to read the morality of student radicalism, so recently so promising and so vital, as decaying at its center and as far less humane than many of us would prefer to believe.

Finally, there is another problem that must be considered in evaluating the new morality which has found its voice in youth — particularly in college youth. Throughout the history of man, his communities have had to steer between the Scylla of ossification through too much discipline and too slavish a reverence for tradition and convention and the Charbydis of dissolution or conquest because of an efflorescence of individualism and privatism that makes cooperation impossible. Many civilizations have failed, foundering on the rocks of either overorganization or anarchy, both of which are culturally fatal. Because extremes tend to beget extremes, and because ours is an age in which the bureaucratization, systematization, rationalization, and routinization of life proceed at a subtle but startling pace, it may be well to remember that the correctives, deeply desirable as they may be, hold their dangers, too. The existentialist, highly personal moral stance of many contemporary young people, despite its considerable virtues, recalls Bertrand Russell's observation 4) that "With subjectivism in philosophy, anarchism in politics goes hand in hand" and his unhappy examples of the fate of the Anabaptists and the course of romanticism in the development of Western society. If we are to achieve both authentic personhood and a genuine sense of community in the modern world, and if the university is to play its significant part in the quest for that achievement, then the emerging power of contemporary youth must be disciplined by an awareness of the moral vulnerability common to all men. That vulnerability is currently italicized by the attractiveness of the dissent-to-resistance slogan, and a major question before us all is that of whether students will display the sensitivity of the genuinely educated in responding to it.

References

1. Daniel Bell, "Notes on the Post-Industrial Society," *Public Interest,* Winter and Spring Issues, 1967, (Vol. II), No. 6, pp. 24-35. No. 7, pp. 102-118.
2. See the memorandum of 30 October, 1967, by President Martin Meyerson to all members of the academic community at SUNY—Buffalo. The statement was drafted immediately after an episode of interference with the activity of a Dow Chemical recruiter.
3. John Fischer, "The Consequences of Peace," *Harper's Magazine,* February, 1968, (Vol. 236), p. 18.
4. In *A History of Western Philosophy.* New York: Simon and Schuster, 1945. p. xi.

RESPONSIBILITY OF LEADERSHIP

DR. VIRGINIA R. KIRKBRIDE
Dean of Women
and Associate Professor of
of Educational Psychology
George Washington University

I appreciate the invitation to be here and especially this very warm welcome. I am delighted to have this opportunity to share with you some of my thoughts as they relate to your general theme — "Today's Education for Tomorrow".

In the field of education we are faced today with unprecedented challenges, the validity of established concepts and approaches are being questioned and attacked not only by many within the profession, but even more seriously by those whom we serve. Events are taking place in many of our schools today which were unheard of a decade ago. In some cases they represent extremism and out-right rebellion, some explainable and some without any discernable explanation.

It has been said that educators need to be contortionists to get along in these difficult and demonstrative days. First of all, we have to keep our backs to the wall and that's not hard with all the pressures that we have — and our ears to the ground, which is much more difficult. We're expected to put our shoulders to the wheel, our noses to the grindstone, keep level heads and both feet on the ground and at the same time have our heads in the clouds so that we can look for the silver lining. Well, sometimes the clouds seem pretty dark, but this is our challenge. And, I think perhaps it is good for us. We need to be stirred from our complacency and forced to come to grips with the accelerated demands of a new generation in a greatly changed and rapidly changing society. Whether we like it or not we are in the midst of it and whether we like it or not we can't very well say — to borrow a phrase — "Stop the world, I want to get off". In my view the times in which we live, permeated as they are by a spirit of restlessness and discontent with the present, and by feelings of uncertainty, insecurity, and even some dispair as to the future, in almost cataclysmic proportions, demand the ablest, the strongest and the most effective leadership.

This is true in government, industry and society. Yes, and even more, in education because it is on today's students that our future is dependent. The ability of administrators and faculties, from grade to college level, to provide active and effective leadership will in a large measure determine the success or failure of our educational programs which in turn will determine the kind of world we have tomorrow. It is to this kind of active and effective leadership that I address my remarks to this evening.

Up to the last 15 years it was fashionable to talk about leadership in the terms of the quality of a leader — you know, what makes a leader. Nowadays most of us believe that there is mighty little nutrition in that approach. So, in recent years most of us have been talking in terms of the techniques of a leader. How does a leader behave? Unquestionably there is pay dirt in this approach and I am sure that you are all familiar with it. But, tonight I propose to ask you to examine with me the leader from a somewhat different angle, that of his goal or purpose. What is he trying to do? What obligations do his objectives impose upon him? Although much has been written of leadership and group behaviour, I have found nothing on this particular aspect of the problems of leadership. None-the-less, I cannot avoid feeling that is worthy of exploration. The result is that this talk is pretty much completely original, compounded of my personal experiences over more years than I care to tell, of studying and working with competent leaders and in applying various techniques in my career as an administrator and a college professor.

For purposes of this discussion I propose to define a leader as the person who, under proper authority, exercises influence on the behaviour of other persons. We will probably refer to these other persons, as followers, and in our case as colleagues or students as a member of the team. In passing let us take note of two things in this definition. One, if we are to discuss leadership in terms of the responsibilities of the leader we can hardly get along without the content of authority. The leader must have the right to do what he does. It is up to each one of us to be certain in which areas we have this authority. And, also, to delineate clearly these areas of authority which those working under us hold. Secondly, the leader must influence the behaviour of others. People must do things or fail to do things because of him. This rules out the so-called laissez-faire leader and the person who acts only as an agent to carry out the wishes of others. And, we will be considering only the ethical leader, one whose goals and objectives are dictated by high standards.

Now, with the decks cleared of a possible misunderstanding, we can proceed with our exploration. It seems to me that a leader has four basic responsibilities. First, to get the job done. Second, to develop the group that he leads, to make it a better group. Third, to aid in the growth of each member of his group, and fourth, to do his share in making this a better world.

To whom does the leader owe this responsibility? Certainly, at least, to the authority which appointed him, the group which he leads, and the human being whom he leads. Note that we are deliberately distinguishing between the group and the individual members. It seems to me that these are separate and distinct areas involving separate and distinct responsibilities and lastly, himself, the culture to which he belongs and the God who created him and gave him the capacity for leadership.

Now, let us go back to the four basic responsibilities and discuss them, one at a time.

The leaders first responsibility is to get the job done. This responsibility is first in sequence because, above all, it is basic and is the first responsibility that leaders recognize. Too often it is the only one that some of them ever recognize. But, I hasten to tell you and to emphasize it is not enough to get the job done. On the other hand, it should be argued that whoever fails in this first responsibility fails in all. No matter how effectively a leader discharges his other obligations, if he fails to produce in this competitive world of ours, he fails in all. We cannot afford to entrust ourselves, or our young people or our problems to ineffectual people. In recent years in this country, government, industry and education have been swamped with speakers who talk on human relations. Now, it is natural, but, I think this is, for the most part, good, since occasionally I am one of these speakers.

Just think of the large number of well meaning people who have managed to get the distorted idea that human relations means being nice to people, that all you have to do is just to be pleasant, and all good things will naturally follow. I am certain that those of you who are educational leaders, whether administrators or teachers, will agree with me that this just is not so. Even the kindest, the most understanding of leaders sometimes have unpleasant tasks to do. There are misfits that get into all groups and dealing with them just is not fun. Even the capable people with whom you and I work are not all perfect. They misunderstand sometimes, they get emotional, unreasonable, and now and then, the best of them go off the beam. But, you and I, those of us who would lead, have to keep the shop running, keep things on balance, and this often means that we have to set the watch. The first responsibility, then, is to set high standards of performance and adhere to them with firmness and fairness. For example, in my experience, I have found that many students need help in learning to understand themselves and in understanding us. The educational leader can, by listening and by giving students an opportunity to test themselves and their ideas, often aid them in determining the validity of their thinking and ultimately in developing personal values for themselves, which will change the direction of their energies into more constructive channels.

The second responsibility of the leader is to develop the group which he leads. There always needs to be a group wherever there needs to be a leader. The very essence of leading involves not only getting people to work but getting them to work purposefully and constructively together as a team. Getting the job done involves using a team. Without the cooperation and teamwork of your faculty you cannot be a successful administrator. And without the cooperation and teamwork of your students you cannot be a successful teacher. The more nearly the truth is a real team working together, the more effectively it does the job, and the more valuable it becomes in doing other and bigger jobs. Well, you may ask, how do you go about developing a team? It seems to me that several specific steps are involved. I offer these as suggestions. First, we must often begin by teaching members of the group that they are a team, and that it is good to be a member of a team. We are all familiar with the typical American attitude of independence and it has many virtues to commend it, but the day of the lone wolf is gone. In a society as highly developed and complex as ours independence of action is no longer possible or practical. Our lives are far too interrelated to go it alone. Secondly, we must help them to discover or develop the team's goals, its purposes, where it wants to go and how it can get there. This may often require a complete indoctrination to new ideas and a sublimation of old ones. Thirdly, we must help them to learn to look at things from the point of view of the team. For some individuals it is difficult to see things other than from their own individual point of view. But, real growth comes only as one becomes able to understand, to appreciate and to evaluate other points of view. Finally, we must give them training and purpose in working as a team. Here we leaders must school ourselves, to talk less, to direct less, to encourage our followers to work more and more with each other, for it is through working together that people develop team work. Holman, a well known sociologist, writing in the field of human relations, said the more we work together the better we like each other and the better we like each other the better we work together. The reaction and the result are circular in effect. The leader must recognize that it is necessary that team members get to know each other as people, be they administration, faculty or student teams. The leaders should encourage interest in a wide variety of areas, in order that the group members may develop broader perspectives and widen their horizons.

The third responsibility of a leader is to aid in the growth of every member of the team. Every individual has strengths and weaknesses and the leader must be able to recognize them. The wise leader can then bring out the best in each member of the team. He encourages creativity in their approach, is not afraid of new and sometimes astonishing ideas. The leader himself will be receptive to new ideas as a means of increasing his own understanding and effectiveness. After all, none of us can lay claim to perfection. We can stand a little refurbishing from time to time.

The fourth responsibility of a leader is to do his share in making this a better world. You and I belong to a culture, to a nation that believes in efficiency. We build more and better automobiles, we build them faster and we use more of them than any other nation in the world. So, also, with farm machinery, air-conditioners, telephones, billboards, and now even the space capsule and the satellite. We are members of a materialistic nation. Certainly I think this is good but I don't think that it is the only kind of good. You and I are not ants chasing one another around on an ant hill, nor mules on a treadmill. The job of working and the joy of having are very real joys but there are also other joys. We leaders must not commit ourselves to get so interested in getting bigger and better production, getting the job done even better and better, that we blind ourselves to spiritual values. I am certain that almost every one of you shares with me a persistent longing to somehow or other leave this world a little better than the one we were born in. Each of us expresses this wish in one way or another from the daily good deed of the Boy Scout to the Foundations of Carnegie, Rockefeller, Ford, Guggenheim. I have known men and women so full of efficiency that they have no time for family, for community, for country, for God, not even for self. And, leaders, we owe it to ourselves to keep our viewpoints broad, to keep in the forefront of our minds this vital responsibility of doing our personal share in making this a better world. For my part, I cannot help feeling that you and I need during these uncertain times, even more than usual, to keep in mind the vital importance of spiritual values. It seems to me, that every human needs to believe in something. Even more this is true of leaders. Each one of us loses his sense of perspective now and then, and under the pressure of getting the job done, since we are human, this is going to happen and it's going to keep on happening in the future. I suggest to you that it will be of help to all of us if we resolve now and again, and again in the future, to remember to take time out to regain that perspective, to remind ourselves that we fail in all if we fail to get the job done but getting the job done for its own sake is fruitless. We must constantly reaffirm to ourselves our obligations and rededicate ourselves to the task of doing our share in making a better world for those who follow after us.

Thank you.

WHAT'S AHEAD FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES?

DONALD A. ELDRIDGE

President, Bennett College, Millbrook

Thank you for this invitation to be here with you and for all that has gone along with it. This is not going to be an address. What I'd really like to do today is to share confusion with you. In these remarks I will hopefully share with you some contemplations on the future and underscore a few of the excellent ideas that have been expressed here.

In this day of fantastic developments, as Dr. Shoben suggested, it is terribly important to know where we are going.

You know they say when Columbus started out he did not know where he was going and when he got there he did not know where he was and after he had gotten back he did not know where he had been. I wonder sometimes whether this has been, in part, the case with some of us in the Junior College movement. We have had to move so fast, changes have come about so quickly, that we know where we have been all right, and I guess we know where we are — we know where we are here, right now, — but I am not sure, really, whether most of us have taken out as much time as we should to try to contemplate where we are going. I happened to hear on the radio this morning that Commissioner Allen has been quoted as saying they would try to come up with an authorization of some money to make a study and, I wrote this down right away. What he said, according to the radio report, was that this study would try to determine whether the two-year colleges are keeping in time with modern needs, and then, subsequently, whether they are properly financed. This is about as hot and timely a quotation as I could find to work into these remarks. I think, however, that this is an indication of the fact that a lot of people are asking this question. So, let us ponder together briefly what we might perhaps be wise to try to anticipate.

Someone asked me yesterday whether I was going to include comments about public funds for private colleges. Well, of course, I am going to try to because, actually, basically the fundamental problems and issues I think are exactly the same for public and private colleges. Methods perhaps or the kind of emphasis necessary, may vary at certain points but, essentially, as I see it our problems one way or another are very much the same.

These are not notes nor are they scripts that I am going to read. I had a lot of exhibits which I had put together deliberately and some of them I will not use, but these are pertinent and simply reflect some of the things people say about this subject. Maybe you saw in a column "College Forum" in the magazine "College Management", of last January, Presidents Predict Problems for 1968", and it said that in interviewing Junior College presidents, from various parts of the country, they repeated time after time the need for more money and buildings, the need for more buildings and money, the need for financing, the need for money, etc. They contend we need more facilities, but how are we going to get the money? As I read this I felt that it was clearly short-sighted. And, I'm not going to identify these people and don't you dare tell them that I referred to them, if you do take the trouble to look this up. But, actually, there isn't any concern here, with one exception, which expresses any worry about ideas, about the terrible need for qualified faculty, about being sure that we are really giving quality teaching in these institutions, which we are going to need, etc. And, I think most of us have found that it is indeed ideas in the long run, it is the result of good teaching that brings us to the solution to our financial and other problems. In other words, maybe this is a little cart before the "horseish". (I'm sorry I never used that term before)

One of the heads of a private institution, not in this part of the country, not in New York City, nor in even the northeast, commented on the fact that the image of the private junior college is being submerged by increasing emphasis on comprehensive community junior colleges. "It actually boils down to this", he said. "We are worrying about new buildings while the community colleges are concerned about their parking lots. We never have had any difficulty transferring our students into good four-year colleges but now with so many what might be called 'Jerry-built' two-year colleges, we are being tarred with the same brush and losing some stature as a result". I think this is very, very limited, backward thinking. Then another man said, "as I see it, the problem of student unrest is easing up. I am fool-hardy enough to prophesy that 1968 will find other problems taking its place." See how dangerous it is to talk on a subject like this?

A few years ago when the New York World's Fair was being put together some of you, as I was, might have been asked to comment on a few major questions in education. I commented, first, that I thought the major advance in the past 25 years was the phenominal development of the two-year colleges in these United States and the resultant stimulation of the further education of thousands of people who might not be found inside a school. Second, the significant change of attitude brought about in individuals involved in the educational process, in making satisfactory adjustments, in groups moving at their own pace, and so on. And then, it seemed to me at that time that the encouragement of individuals to move each at his own pace was reflected in all kinds of very significant developments including, particularly, the various opportunities offered by our colleges, both public, community colleges and private.

One of the great things that worries me about the future and I think we have to answer it if we are to fulfill our needs, as I indicated here, is that the school of tomorrow almost certainly will have to include programs taking account of various kinds of intelligence and move away from what it seemed to me for many years to be one of the most important weaknesses that we have, and that is a hanging on to the stereotype definition of the "I.Q.". Again, Dr. Shoben spoke of this yesterday. In his talk he spoke of two groups from entirely different generations being subjected to the same tests, measured by, in effect, the same norms. It is sheer nonsense. We are beginning to learn, at long last, that verbal facility which has been given such high premium is only one form of intelligence. I think that we have to face up to this new means of measuring and providing for development of different kinds of intelligence. Again, I think all of us are doing a great deal in this field.

The school of tomorrow will include many programs with increased emphasis on international education — international understanding. Some of you know, I am sure, and maybe all of you don't, that the American Association of Junior Colleges is planning to have the Fiftieth Convention in the Fiftieth of the State, which will be based on an international education theme. We are meeting in Honolulu next January, with representatives from junior colleges in Japan, Canada, Chili, probably India, and possibly some other Pacific countries. It is planned jointly and this international educational convention, as far as we know, will be the first of its kind ever attempted by any group. I mention it because I think it is an example of looking ahead. We are not being condescending in setting it up and asking these other people if they would like to come. We are planning to engage mutually in working out a program which we hope and pray will bring some important suggestions, at least, and perhaps answers to some of our grave international problems.

Part of our problem always is overwhelming numbers and how we deal with individuals, how we deal with the extraordinary variety of demands placed upon us and still manage all those numbers. Some of you have read I am sure excerpts of an interview with the new Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Mr. Cohen, where he was asked such questions as "Would you lend your support or move to see to it that every person, regardless of income, should be entitled to higher education to the heights to which he is intellectually able to go?" And, the response was "yes". "How close are we now to that objective?" Here again he refers to the increasing numbers of undergraduates in our colleges — six million at the present time and he believes that by 1975, there will be about nine million people in college. Then, he makes his commitment on Federal financial aid of various kinds — subsidizing individuals as well as institutions — and then when asked if he hopes to promote any new directions in Federal aid he said he hopes that future aid will have room for innovating.

As far as facilities and equipment are concerned — Joe Shoben mentioned this — the question is what technology will do to us or for us to accommodate numbers. Some of you probably attended or saw notice of this program sponsored by the American Management Association — "The Impact of Education on Technology". These things are being sponsored by both business and educational establishments . . .

Then there are these quotations from an article in the "Syracusian" which ought to be read because I think we should try to keep these things in perspective, lest we get panicky. Let me just read this to you — "It is an extraordinary era in which we live. It is altogether new, the world has seen nothing like it before, I will not pretend as no one can pretend to discern the end. But, everybody knows that the age is remarkable for scientific research into the heavens, the earth and what is beneath the earth. And, perhaps what is more remarkable is the application of the scientific research to the pursuit of life. The ancients saw nothing like it and the moderns have seen nothing like it until the present generation. The progress of the age has almost outstretched human belief." And, then, Mr. Thiebolt explains that "Those words were not spoken today but were used in 1857, by Daniel Webster, when he opened a new stretch of railroad tracks in New Hampshire."

The temptation is great to tell you I am impressed, for example, by the Dartmouth College computer installation which serves Dartmouth and all the colleges and universities in the area and, also, secondary schools. I just happen to have this as a sample — this is a very small co-educational boarding school near Augusta, Maine. They are using computer instruction for example in freshman Math. in high school. What does this do to us? What does this do to our faculties when these youngsters can come in with sophistication that exceeds that which we have. Indeed, at Dartmouth, I am told the faculty resisted the move toward having every Dartmouth undergraduate exposed to some computer education. Then they finally, after resisting a while, had to subject themselves to learn something about this too, so that the students wouldn't be so obviously brighter or more advanced than they. This is true. This is going to be a problem for faculty.

Then, of course, there is the impact which many of you have to anticipate in the technical aspects of this. The last I.B.M. report to stockholders reported that in 1964 they hired more than 30,000 additional people in the United States just to work with their new system No. 360. Since '64 more than 30,000 additional people just to work with this new technical advance! Where are we going to find the people, administrators, etc. to manage this? I worry about this. I will not requote statistics from the junior college factor alone. It is appalling when you think of needing 50,000 a year for ten years, for new faculty, administrators, etc., and, occasionally when you receive a letter of application from a prospective teacher for teaching English (and this is a literal quote as I have such a letter on a purple ditto process) The fellow thinks he wants to move up from a high school teaching position to teaching at a junior college. He says "I am in my *forth* year of teaching." (forth) — then there were some other things in this letter — well! It makes one think of the news article regarding outstanding teachers to hire and others to "promote". Things are happening, however, in the news and other literature and we come across all kinds of things, for example, appeals to teachers, teacher enrichment, teacher training programs, efforts by the Association of Colleges, University Schools of Teacher Education, A.A.J.C.'s efforts and the efforts of Foundations, of course. Things are happening but we still need a lot of thought to be given to ways of doing, ways of people.

I see competition between all of us — public, private, small and large, and for the most part of the large state supported established universities. Then, there will be competition for good talent at the teacher and administrative level. I hope, as we look ahead, that one thing that we will do is develop very carefully cooperation between the various parts of the educational establishment. That is why I was pleased to see both of these resolutions adopted at this meeting. I think they are important. And, this is a two-way arrangement. As we know, the student that comes through the two-year college, and still wants to go on, and has proved his or her ability, is a darn good bet. I speak as a former admissions officer of one of our very selective men's liberal arts colleges in New England. This particular institution is planning to establish a coordinate college for women. At the moment it is thinking very seriously at the trustee, administrative and faculty levels of starting, at least at the beginning, by admitting women only at the third year. It is looking to a two-year program with the Master's degree, particularly in the social service professions, such as teaching, etc. This is the kind of positive, imaginative, cooperative endeavor which I see working very well. Also, I can see arrangements whereby some of us take on, in a kind of intern basis, promising young teachers. Let's say we have a young man from Williams working for his Doctorate at Penn. and teaching for us in the process. Upon the completion of the Doctorate he may want to go into Liberal Arts, college or university teaching. In the meantime he provides us with some very good teaching for a while and he gets some very good experience which he couldn't get at a larger institution. If we can establish this kind of rapport with the universities, we can get a feed back that will be mutually very beneficial.

Another thing that has been mentioned previously, at this excellent conference, is the matter of both student and faculty power. One of our great problems as I see it is to persuade our faculty, in general, to face up to some of these things as we do when we come to a conference like this, to accept their responsibility and recognize the drift. So many of them, in response to student activism, are taking it as a personal reproach. They are being very resistant, they don't want to admit that the student has anything to offer, and they complain to the president, the trustees, or the dean, anybody except — they don't want to look in the glass, to see the situation face to face. This I really think is a very serious problem that we have to work through as we look ahead.

I want to call your attention to an excellent article, in this bulletin of Pace, which some of you may have seen, on this subject of "Student Activism". It puts it very, very well into perspective by quoting Dick Sullivan as saying "in his judgment, the Age of the College President has declined, that the Age of the Faculty (which we are now in) is declining, and we are already entering on the threshold of the Age of the Student". This has a good deal of significance which administrators and faculty need to accept. We need, too, to recognize a shift in mores, new interrelationships that are being built, and that here we are working with an approach to learning that is, as Dr. Shoben pointed out, several decades out of date. How do we get our faculty to go along with us? Sometimes I wonder whether it is worse as an administrator to be more progressive and liberal than the faculty and suffer frustration, or to be more conservative and have the faculty more progressive and liberal. I don't know. I have never seen the latter situation.

Now, private vs. public — there's going to be competition for the dollar. We see predictions that all colleges will be free by 1970. Terry Ferrar in the old *Herald Tribune* saw the necessary tuition rise for private education seriously jeopardizing the choice which students have. How much more is the private college education worth? How much more double taxation (in effect) can parents pay? This whole business of New York State Aid (I was glad to see us pass that resolution this morning) is very significant to us all. Certainly we are going to need support from public funds if we are to continue to do the kind of work that the private college is freer to do — in innovation, in experimentation, etc.

We in the U.S.A. are doing a great job. Do you know that statistics show that in England something like 5% of high school graduates go to college, Germany 8%, France 15%, U.S.S.R. 24%, and the U.S.A. 43%? No longer do we see higher education as a privilege or luxury; it is something that every young person has a right to expect. And, that is what we are in this business to provide.

It seems to me as though all of us suffer, though in various ways perhaps, from the so-called "image". With a college like Cazenovia or Bennett, this is the persistance with which we are called a "finishing school". This we are NOT. The finishing school served an excellent purpose in its time and people just don't realize that we've kept up with educational change. On the other hand, we have the Community College. You've heard it referred to as a "trade school", with equally though opposite disdain, perhaps. They are NOT trade schools. This persistance of the no longer true image is something we have to overcome. Fortunately, we are succeeding in very important circles. Foundations are now coming to the American Association of Junior Colleges, asking if we will take on some of their projects. This has led into some really substantial grants now underway for work in the inner city, a program for continuing education, for aid to developing institutions. There is a project now in operation among junior colleges exploring how they may further justify their existence. I've already referred to international education. Junior colleges can provide significantly for the training of leadership in this field. As you well know, many of us are doing much for foreign students now and we will do even more. May I remind you at this point, that if you or your colleagues have ideas that are worthy of support you should present them to Ed Glasier or somebody at the universities who knows of the plans or programs in operation which will be able to gear in these welcomed ideas.

Many of us need to follow the lead of colleges like Colby in dealing with certain problems — in this case a community problem. You may know that when Colby Junior College planned to have Dick Gregory as a speaker, towns people got up a petition trying to get the college to cancel his appearance. The President and his public relations officer called a public meeting and made a masterful presentation of the importance of academic freedom and its implications in the education of college people. The College got an excellent response not only from the concerned community people but, also, from the press and other media. There are going to be many situations when all of us in the colleges are going to have to take clear, public stands on the ticklish issues that seem to arise almost daily on one compus or another.

Finally, we have to concede the fact that, as Dr. Kirkbride noted last night, by 1980 or '85, or sometime thereafter, work is going to be an inconsequential part of the life of every American. Most of us will be spending much, much less time earning a living than in just living. The implications of this for all of us in education are tremendous and we've got to start and start soon in presenting to young people, and people of all ages opportunities to develop certain standards of values, getting away from what Art Buchwald calls the Bonnie and Clyde standards of American culture and developing in them sensitivity to some of the problems that might have brought this about. Our role is to put these things in perspective so intelligent choices may be made.

May I comment on one final quotation? This is from a *Newsweek* story which mentions that we are moving, as we well know, into a period, the main characteristic of which is change, where there will be very little permanence. One person may have several carers in a liftime. It refers, also, to the comforts and time saving gadgets we are going to have and, finally, *Newsweek* concludes: "Abundance will remove economic barriers; will provide for the sick and the infirm. No one will be looked upon as outcasts. The young will study longer. Women will have a true choice, not just an economically dictated one because of the work involved. But, none of this can happen automatically. Through computors and automated machines that perform wonders, Herculean tasks, humans decide what those tasks will be. Thus automation experts will pinpoint what may be the ultimate challenge of automation". And, I've inserted here: "the challenge of automation and of education". "The big problem is to decide what on earth you want to do because you can do it". So, well, as Lucy said to Charlie Brown "you're mediocre, mediocre, mediocre". And, Charlie said, "That's O.K. as long as I'm above average". You and I know that above average or just average will not do. As I see it, the college of the past was festooned with quietly growing ivy, but today's college is in the full sense a community colleges, in the full sense of community, meeting very pragmatic, urgent, demands right now. We must very, very soon get on top of the present as our first step into the future. We must incorporate the best of the past with the best of the present. We have to mix in a very large dose of that magic ingredient which brings happiness. This is our major task and I commend you to this work.

PANEL I

FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN COLLEGE GOVERNANCE AND POLICY MAKING

By CHARLES E. BENNETT
Cazenovia

Let me first of all make clear that I was invited here as an individual and not as a representative of any group and let me make clear also that it is only for myself that I speak.

I do not propose to argue the right and the merit of faculty participation in the governance of colleges. I cannot believe that there are any here so unenlightened as to need persuading that the faculty has both the right and the responsibility to participate in the governance of colleges. American higher education has long recognized the role of the faculty in governance, and it is no coincidence that the most respected institutions are those where the participation of the faculty is both broad and vigorous. I think few will challenge me when I assert that the good health of a college — junior college or university — is directly related to the degree to which its faculty participate in the governance of the institution. It was certainly that belief that moved the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges to issue jointly, in 1966, their "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities." Their intention in adopting that statement was not to advocate a revolution in the methods by which institutions of higher education are governed — I'm sure that none of those sponsoring associations is much inclined to revolutionary activity — but to codify the principles of governance which have had the approval of practice and opinion. The sponsoring associations believed that such a codification of established principles would be useful in encouraging laggard institutions to bring their own practices into a closer approximation to the best models and in providing newly emerging colleges, the majority of them junior colleges, with guidance in establishing their policies and practices. It should be said that the statement refrains from specifying procedures for faculty participation out of a respect for the pluralistic character of American higher education and an awareness that every college is to some degree unique. The AAUP, the American Council on Education and the Association of Governing Boards have done higher education a substantial service, a service which may well, over the long haul, equal in value that performed by the AAUP in promulgating the 1940 statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

The question then is not whether faculties should participate but how they may most effectively participate. Before attempting to answer that question it is necessary that we consider the degree and character of faculty participation. The sponsors of the joint statement on government assign to the faculty "primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process." The sponsors make clear that when they speak of faculty status as a primary responsibility of the faculty, they include appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure, and dismissals. They also include the determination of policies and procedures governing salary increases. In all the areas which are primarily the concern of the faculty, the sponsors assert that "the governing board and president should . . . concur with the faculty judgment except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be stated in detail." Further, in addition to the areas in which the faculty has primary responsibility, the faculty shares responsibility with other elements of the college community for the general educational policy of the college, the framing and execution of long range plans, decisions regarding existing or prospective physical resources (plant), the allocation of the financial resources among competing demands, and the selection of presidents and academic officers including department chairmen. I may add at this point, though it should be needless, that the promulgation of the joint statement has not terminated the AAUP's concern. The promotion everywhere in higher education of the recognition and implementation of these principles is the policy and program of the AAUP. We may hope that the AAUP will be as successful in protecting the rights of faculty to share in the governance of colleges as it has been in its defense of academic freedom.

But I left a question unanswered: how is the faculty to secure recognition for its role where that recognition is lacking and how is it to exercise its responsibility where that responsibility is acknowledged? The answers to both parts of that question are the same — through the faculty senate. By faculty senate I mean, in the case of a small institution, the faculty meeting together; in the case of a larger institution, a committee of faculty elected by their colleagues; in the case of a university system, it might well be a council of elected representatives from each of the component units of the system as with the present SUNY Senate. All the prerogatives and responsibilities of the faculty in the governance of the academic institution may be — and should be — within the cognizance of the senate.

Where there is a vital senate, whatever it be termed, the effort of the faculty should be to strengthen it. That may be accomplished, first, through the faculty evidencing a commitment to its role in the governance of the college by its willingness to bear the burden of responsibility; and, second, through supporting the senate in the maintenance of a vigorous dialogue with its partners in the governance of the college. On a campus where there is such a senate, a local chapter of the AAUP may be valuable as a means of rallying support for the senate by helping to educate the faculty to its responsibilities. This role of the AAUP chapter is probably of particular importance in the junior college where, at the present time, a significant portion of the faculty are new to higher education by virtue of their having either only recently entered the profession or recently made the transition from high school to college teaching. No graduate course is likely to have prepared a young instructor for his responsibilities as a governor of a college; nor is a high school teacher's experience of school governance likely to have prepared him to be a college governor. While such an educational endeavour may be a primary role of a local AAUP chapter, it should not be the only role. A local chapter may also serve as a forum where faculty may brainstorm free of the procedural discipline of the senate and free, too, from any anxiety about premature public commitment. These sessions may have the effect of crystallizing faculty opinion and from them may emerge specific proposals which may then be addressed to the senate for disposition. My own chapter at Cazenovia College has served both these purposes effectively. Allow for my bias as a past president of the chapter whatever way you will, the Chapter has had its accomplishments. I would cite one instance: after discussion of the faculty's responsibility to participate in the selection of a president and academic dean, the Chapter formulated a statement of procedures to be followed in selecting those officers: The effect of those procedures is to guarantee that neither the faculty nor the governing board can foist upon the other a president or an academic dean who is unacceptable to the other governing partner. The proposal was forwarded by the Chapter to our version of a faculty senate and from there to the governing board by whom it was approved without so much as the insertion or deletion of a comma.

But to return to those ailing institutions which have either no faculty senate or one that is moribund. What of them? As teachers we should know the answer. The prescription for this ill is education. The faculty must educate itself as to its responsibilities and must then educate the administration and the governing board; those latter must be made aware of the benefits which will accrue to the institution as a result of their admitting the faculty to the role in the governance of the college to which tradition and qualification entitle it. A local chapter of the AAUP, in those circumstances, may be a very effective educational instrument. It may serve as a means of focusing faculty concern and may serve, in the absence of a healthy faculty senate, as a voice of the faculty, a voice inviting a dialogue with the administration and the board. And it is a voice that may well be heard, for its voice is given added timbre by the fact that, when it speaks for faculty prerogatives in the governance of the college, it speaks with the support of the national association. I may add that it is my understanding that the Association is ready to provide any chapter — or college — with assistance in formulating procedures for faculty participation in governance appropriate to that college and even, if the situation requires, representing the interests of the faculty to the administration and board of governors.

My case, then, is simply put: a strong faculty senate is the appropriate and most effective agency through which a faculty may exercise its responsibilities in the governance of the college. No agency external to the college, and that includes the AAUP, can represent the faculty half as well as the faculty can represent itself. External agencies may, however, contribute to the support of the senate and should be valued in accordance with the support they give. By that measure, I believe the AAUP to be an asset to be valued on any campus.

But what is special about the AAUP? Would not some other organization serve as well, or perhaps better, than the AAUP? A union perhaps, that was willing to bargain collectively with the administration on behalf of the faculty and that was willing to take a more militant stance than the AAUP? In a word, No!

Try to imagine the United Auto Workers formulating a statement which said that the employees of General Motors had a primary right to determine what the corporation should manufacture, what methods of manufacturing should be used, and which cars should be certified as marketable. Imagine further that the statement claimed that employees had the right to select, promote and dismiss other employees. Imagine that the statement claimed a right for the employees to share in the determination of the general policy of the corporation, the development and execution of future plans, the expenditure of income, and the selection of the president and officers of the corporation. Now further imagine the Auto Workers' proposal endorsed by the Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers. If you can imagine all that, you have a better imagination than I. Such a state of affairs is beyond the wildest dreams of trade unionist and yet that is the situation that prevails in higher education. Our inability to imagine such a state of affairs in industry reveals the fallacy in the arguments of the unionists. They are attempting to impose upon institutions of higher education a pattern which, to be sure, has worked well enough in industry but which has no appropriateness in higher education. The distinction between management and employees does not apply to administrators and faculty. The proof that it does not is the statement sponsored jointly by the AAUP, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards. Yet it is this mythical distinction which the unionists would impose; they would substitute for the cooperative sharing of responsibility by administration and faculty an adversary relationship, the effect of which must be to undermine the faculty's role in our colleges and universities. I can think of few things more inimical to the interests of either the faculty or higher education. The unionist may protest that the situation that I describe is an ideal, that it does not exist. Ah, but it does. True, it may not exist universally but it does exist at our best colleges. And it should exist at all. Equality of educational opportunity for all Americans is an ideal; it has not been universally realized. But rather than that being a reason for abandoning the ideal, it is rather a reason for our rededicating ourselves to it. Just so with faculty governance.

The unionists may further protest that they have no desire to undermine the faculty's role, that they are, in fact, committed to the support of the faculty senate. One spokesman for a union has allowed that his union wishes them "to be invested with complete authority in the area of curriculum, scholarship and student activities." One cannot help but note the omission from the list of the area of faculty status — appointment and dismissal, promotion and tenure — an area clearly assigned to the faculty by the joint statement on government. Obviously that areas is to be reserved to the union. What it is suggested we should have is a division of faculty responsibility between the senate and the union. The senate would represent the academic interests of the faculty and the union the economic. I suggest that such a division of authority does represent a subversion of the senate and I suggest further more that it will not work. Academic and economic concerns are not separable. Is the use to be made of graduate assistants on academic or an economic concern? Is the sabbatical leave policy an academic or an economic concern? Is teacher work load an academic or an economic concern? Clearly the distinction is not viable. If there is a division of responsibility between the senate and a union the result must be a collision of the two. In that collision it is the senate that will come off second best for the prerogatives of a union which has been granted exclusively as a bargaining agent are protected by law; the law does not recognize those of the faculty senate.

The AAUP believes that the faculty ought to represent itself and be its own bargaining agent and urges that the faculty senate perform those functions. in those rare cases where a faculty senate does not exist or cannot effectively function, then the AAUP is willing to present itself as the best qualified bargaining agent. Among its primary objectives as a bargaining agent will be the creation and invigoration of a faculty senate to the end that the senate may, at an appropriate time, become, in place of the AAUP chapter, the representative of and bargaining agent for the faculty.

In the end it is to our own faculties that we must turn rather than to the intervention of outside agencies. The AAUP warns us that we "should be especially concerned to avoid dependence on external representative agencies that diminish the opportunities for faculty self-government." The only organization that I know whose effect is not to diminish the opportunities for faculty self-government is the AAUP. If we feel the need for external support, and well we may, let us turn to the AAUP whose qualification is unimpeachable, but let us look first to our own resources — they may be greater than we realize.

THE GOLDEN MEAN FOR FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN COLLEGE GOVERNANCE

ISRAEL GLASSER
NYCCC

The elusive golden mean is as difficult to attain in the domain of faculty involvement in college governance and policy making as it is in other areas of human activity. Difficult though it may be, it is my view that the golden mean is nevertheless the objective to which we must strive.

The location of this golden mean lies somewhere between the views of the two groups whom I shall call the communalists and the instrumentalists.

The position of the communalists draws inspiration from a number of sources. However, what best characterizes this broad grouping is a mixture of a democratic ideology, a humanist and anti-authoritarian outlook on life and the social contract theory of Jean Jacques Rousseau. Basically the communalist sees the college as a community, one that arose from the banding together of scholars who were free men seeking the advantages of group life. The medieval university could easily serve as a symbol of that pure community. It follows, therefore, that the modern college would be viewed as a corruption from the wondrous era when scholars controlled their own destinies without the intervention of Trustees, Regents, Chancellors, Presidents, Provosts and Deans.

To the communalist the good life in Academe is to be obtained by drastically reducing the power and influence of the corrupting governing bodies and administration. Putting it in positive terms, the faculty must be restored to its former sovereign position. Some clerks and technicians would be needed to take care of the routine chores but they would be servants and not masters of the academic community.

The machinery for executing faculty made policy is simple enough to be handled by non-professionals. There is a striking similarity between this approach and the approach of the Jacksonian Democrats to American government over a century ago.

On the opposite extreme from the communalists are the instrumentalists. The instrumentalists draw their inspiration from the systems analysts, modern administrative management experts, and master planners. In the instrumentalists' vocabulary one encounters such terminology as: *manpower needs, capital budgets, master plans, coordination, cost-performance standards,* and *public service.* While these suggest a feeling tone of authoritarian efficiency, I do not mean to say that the instrumentalists reject democracy. Rather, they accept the reality that our highly specialized and complex society requires the bureaucratic mode of organization and direction. The instrumentalists see higher education as a sub-system of the larger of our society. The college as part of a larger system is assigned inputs such as money, and brain power, and in turn is expected to produce socially valuable outputs such as trained personnel and advances in technology.

The instrumentalist's concern with how each college is related to the subsystem of higher education and ultimately how higher education is related to the general social structure causes him to attempt to integrate higher education into the general order much as he would integrate a hospital sub-system or a transportation sub-system. With this as a point of departure it is understandable that the instrumentalist prefers to have the definition of broad policy for the college come more from the imperatives of the macro-structure (society) than from those of the micro-structure (the college and its faculty). Power to determine policy should therefore be more logically placed in the hands of Regents, Trustees, and college administrations who are either already oriented to the macro-structural approach or can be brought into line as the public policy requires.

The position taken by each group, communalist and instrumentalist, is logical and internally consistent. Yet the adoption of either one as the entire basis for determining faculty participation in college governance would result in the virtual negation of important insights of the other. As an advocate of the golden mean I would seek to optimize the realization of the positive values of both polar views. The resort to two illustrations might serve to clarify this viewpoint.

Admissions policy in public community colleges left entirely in the hands of individual college faculties (as might be advanced by staunch communalists) could easily result in the abandonment of important contemporary social objectives. Each faculty could easily adopt a "high standards" approach that would seek to enroll the "best" students, using the standard indicators of academic potential. Clearly, public policy in this half of the 20th century is committed to widening opportunities in higher education to students of average or even below average academic attainment. In general it is the public community colleges which have been assigned the task of extending opportunity to the median academic achiever and those in the lower end of the socio-economic spectrum. Many of us here have often heard our colleagues sigh for the adoption of student admissions policies which would subvert these very objectives for which public community colleges have been created. The communalist prescription that faculty be allowed to formulate all policy would thus facilitate a disregard of the public interest. Similar problems could arise in formulating policies on the relative distribution between career and liberal arts transfer programs in the public community colleges and the question of converting community colleges into four year colleges.

The instrumentalist approach also has its limitations. The detailed involvement of boards of trustees in matters of student dress and decorum or their prescribing specific courses in curriculums could be cited as illustrations of the instrumentalist view carried to undesirable extremes. The college is, after all, a community in which students and faculty live an important portion of their lives. Those immediately affected by the teaching-learning atmosphere are probably best situated to define the optimum conditions in such matters as dress and decorum. As far as specific course requirements are concerned, the faculty is in better equipped by virtue of professional experience to make these educational decisions than the trustees or their agents.

The extreme communalist view of "all power the faculty" is unacceptable in this day and age. It fails to take proper account of the responsibilty of the college to the society which nourishes and sustains it. In a democratic society the organs of government are the legitimate articulators of public policy.

On the other extreme, the instrumentalist view of the college as simply another social service to be integrated with the overall bureaucratic mechanism must also be rejected. This view fails to take into account the fact that the normal techniques of control which work well in certain areas do not operate with the same degree of efficiency in the realm of intellect. The qualitative aspects of college outputs are far more important than the quantitative. Hence the techniques of measuring outputs are not so easily applied as in other areas of public concern. While one can measure the number of student-hours of lecture provided, it is not so easy to measure the inspired and inspiring lectures. Nor can one measure too readily the individual professor's out-of-the-class advice and counsel to students, a function that is of critical value to the individual student and to the educational program of the college. It is in precisely these qualitative areas that some of the bureaucratic controls ordinarily effective in other areas prove to be either unavailable or unavailing in the colleges. The general acceptance of the principles of academic freedom and faculty tenure sharply reduce the number of coercive techniques that can be used to command performance in higher education. Even if more coercive authority were condoned, how could it be used to command creativity, enthusiasm, sensitivity to human needs and commitment to the values of scholarship?

The golden mean in faculty participation in college governance and policy making must be predicated on the acceptance of the following twin propositions:

1. The college is an integral part of the social order. In a democratic society the college's functions and objectives must be determined by the representative authorities of that society.
2. The college has special needs that must be recognized if it is to effectively discharge its obligations to the social order. One of the most important of these needs is an atmosphere which maximizes voluntarism. This is best achieved by enlisting the energies and talents of the faculty in making policy within the broad mandates of the college.

What are the implications of golden mean? To those who represent the public interest (Regents, Trustees, Legislatures, and Central administrations) it means avoiding *over*-control in those policy areas in which the faculty has an expertise to offer. It requires the exercise of good judgement in authorizing structures of faculty self-government that will demonstrate confidence in the faculty's professional opinions. This is essential first as a means of encouraging the fullest use of the competence residing in the faculty. Secondly, it is a means for developing in the faculty a responsibility for relating its insights to broader social goals. This does not mean that governing bodies should abandon their legal trusts to direct the colleges in accordance with the socially defined goals. It does, however, imply the need for some humility in governing bodies. The recognition of the governing bodies' own fallibility and their concession that faculties are excellent resources for determining the most appropriate educational means to the socially determined ends might be a good starting point in the development of that humility. Restraint in the use of the decisive powers of purse and legal authority by governing bodies is recommended when in dealing with faculty positions that differ from their own.

Raw power used too often will dry up the well springs of voluntarism so essential to the attainment of the excellence we all seek to achieve in our colleges.

Most of all, the legal governors of our colleges must avoid the worst practice of all, the hypocritical stance of creating paper structures of faculty power but tolerating a cynical manipulation of administrative power to stifle the legitimate expression of faculty views. This stance unfortunately is too often an appealing one to the authoritarian governing boards and administrations who have learned to employ the shibboleths of faculty participation in college governance without a corresponding commitment to the practice. This is the surest way to alienate a faculty.

What does the golden mean suggest in the way of guides to the faculty? Foremost it means that the faculty must accept the notion that the college does not belong to it alone. So long as the college looks for resources from the general society to support fair salaries, decent physical facilities, and adequate equipment it is not reasonable to expect complete faculty autonomy in managing the affairs of the college.

Once faculty members accept the idea they can not alone control the destiny of their college they must be prepared to accept the principle that they have no inherent right to change the basic purposes of the college through the organs of faculty government. This is not to deny to them as citizens of the *general* community the right to redefine the purposes of the college by recourse to established methods and channels.

The faculty must recognize that the college administration has an indispensable role to play in the management of the college; that the administration qua administration has insights into college management that flow from its specialized concern with the complex art-science of college administration. A good administration can add a very substantial increment to the efforts of a faculty by prudent management and inspired leadership. A poor administration, it should be added by way of balance can demoralize what would otherwise be an excellent institution. My counsel to college faculties is this: avoid the rhetoric of class warfare with the administration always cast as the villain and the faculty as the good guys. More productive would be the effective utilization of faculty organs for continuous surveillance and review of administrative performance. Maladministration should be identified and corrective recommendations made by a concerned faculty. It would not be remiss to accord an administration which is doing a good job the reward of a figurative grade of A from the faculty.

The faculty must insist on organs of faculty government that provide it with an effective forum to discuss college problems and to formulate policies that effect the educational program of the college.

In those areas where the faculty interests as employees of the college are involved, the faculty should be free to select means that it feels are appropriate to its needs. Implicit is the reciprical obligation of the governing body of the college to deal no less forthrightly with representatives of faculty employees as it would with building service employees or clerical employees of the college.

Having prescribed the need for balance between the extremes of the communalists on the one hand and the instrumentalists on the other I should, in all fairness, acknowledge that the golden mean is not a precise formula for the distribution of power to govern the college. Rather than a formula the golden mean is an attitude toward power. I should also acknowledge that honest men could disagree in their interpretations of how to apply the golden mean in specific situations. Indeed, I would be prepared to accept the notion that in different circumstances there should be substantial differences in the distribution of power. For example, in older colleges with well established traditions, well defined objectives and stable faculties wider reign should be given to faculties in college governance. Newer colleges or those whose basic objectives are in the process of redefinition would probably be better served by a power distribution that places more initiative and control in administrative hands.

The important point is that the search for the golden mean should be a continuous one. We may never achieve the golden mean in college governance any more than we can attain "the truth", but the striving toward it will lead to a closer approximation of the ideal.

FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN COLLEGE GOVERNANCE AND POLICY MAKING

RUDOLPH A. LAWTON
National Education Association

Any discussion concerning the role of the Faculty in college governance must consider why this is a topic of discussion at all. The traditional college or university has been, at least on the surface, a community of scholars each expressing a great deal of respect not necessarily for each other or for each other's discipline, but rather for the fact each one had a discipline in which he could be considered expert.

Such a community played the game according to the rules, the first of which was getting the P.H.D. so as to make oneself acceptable to the fraternity. Another rule was that of acquiescence to the will of the power structure of the institution. Although this rule was sometimes broken by sporadic forays into the area of academic freedom, usually on some abstract and cosmic subject, nevertheless the basic function of the faculty member of the scheme of things remained the same.

Another rule was that of semi-required participation in the formulation of policy. This frequently meant the selection of course titles, textbooks, guest lectures, control over student grading and the like. To some degree it would appear that by mere presence and default some faculties took over and set their institutions' standards of admission, graduation, class load, initial appointment, tenure, sabbatical leave, etc. However, what became traditional in many established institutions, though comforting to some faculty members, seldom if ever became de jure as well as de facto. There was always the possibility that the board of trustees or the administration could at any time overturn what had been a treasured possession of the faculty.

Admittedly such a possibility was remote be virtue of the presence of many highly respected scholars who over a period of time had drawn unto themselves the power and security that accompanies age, scholarship and competence.

Although opinions differ about the economic status of the academic community of 10 or 15 years ago it seems that the intangible of "professional status" was sufficient to make a meeting such as we are attending today highly improbable.

We are discussing the topic now and it is important to us now because we are in a new and different era of higher education. Higher education is everyone's province. More Americans than ever are demanding a college degree. Regardlss of what we think a college education does for a student and the nation, one fact remains clear. It produces wealth both for the individual as for the society. However, it now costs more and revenues are now being demanded in large quantities from sources which to this time have been either untapped or lightly tapped.

We now need large numbers of buildings, laboratories, machines, professors and administrators. To fill the need for personnel we have recruited from industry, secondary schools, government, labor, and from any other available source. We have obtained so many new people in the past ten or fifteen years that we have "new-lined" the old line institutions and created many new ones completely free of traditional ways of doing things.

The demand for professional services has risen much faster than the supply of quality professors. Two effects of this are that on the one hand there has been a strain put on the need for maintaining standards and on the other that there are now jobs for virtually everyone who is qualified. In spite of the availability of jobs we hear of "unrest on the campus" and even an occasional faculty strike. Professor Arnold R. Weber reported 1) last year on the phenomena as follows:

> *Causes of Unrest*
>
> What are the causes of current faculty unrest on the campus? In this respect, the field studies confirm the professor's view of himself as a unique individual. In conventional labor-management situations, worker discontent is associated with periods of adversity. In contrast, faculty dissatisfaction is clearly a child of growth and affluence. It is apparent to even the most monastic academic that he probably never had it so good in terms of compensation, available employment opportunities, and prestige. At the same time, faculty-administration tensions in institutions of higher education appear to have increased.
>
> The paradox of affluence and unrest may be explained by several factors. Thus, the improvement in the status and well-being of the college professor probably has been accompanied by a more rapid rise in his expectations. This phenomenon is well known in underdeveloped nations and seems to apply to under-developed professions as well. In many institutions, the notion of professionalism is a polite fiction. With the rise in status and the expansion of opportunities, many faculty members now demand the full prerogatives of professionalism. This means that professors, like members of other professions, seek direct participation in the formulation of the policies and rules that govern their performance.

In addition, however, to the professor's desire to exercise his professionalism in the need for his security as an employee. Most college professors cannot afford the luxury of being a "professional under contract" with no guarantees as to condition of work, standards of successful performance, criteria for promotion, and the kind of salary which would insure his economic position in those periods when he would not be "under contract". Today's professor, unless he is single, free to move about the country and not much interested in building a career in one place wants to be assured of a job which has reasonably good conditions for professional service, salaries commensurate with preparation and experience, opportunities for advancement, and freedom from arbitrary or capricious actions of administrators and boards of trustees.

1) Weber, Arnold R. "Academic Negotiating — Academics to College Bargaining" — 22 Nat. Conf. AAMF 3-6-'67

Paradoxically my own contacts with college personnel have shown me that in spite of the availability of positions and in spite of the desires of professors to have a voice in policy making, there is an overpowering cautiousness or fear which beset the faculties of many campuses. This fear is often well justified since many attempts at organizing by professor for faculty participation in decision making have been met by administrative or board reprisal in the form of threats of denial of increments, promotions, summer school assignments or even tenure.

The cautiousness or fear is in no way reduced by the fact that there are many jobs available. The individual at this time is unimpressed by national statistics since his job may be in jeopardy and he does not want to take that teaching position in Iowa or West Virginia. He reacts understandably as an employee to whom job security is important.

Given then the need for employee security and the assumption that the professor should be able to contribute his knowledge and judgement to the overall goals of his college, it becomes necessary to find some means to insure these ends.

The National Education Association advocates the procedures of Professional Negotiations between faculty representatives and those who have the authority to set policy. In addition, we support the idea of a formalized grievance procedure and the use of appeal procedures through designated educational channels when agreement cannot be reached.

The NEA advocates a de jure as well as a de facto position of equality for faculties. We believe that where possible such a position must be actively sought by the faculty organized for that purpose. We also support and work for laws that will make such faculty recognition possible.

The NEA believes that the faculties of colleges and universities should assume their rightful role in those areas where they have an interest and experience. Those areas should include the following:

A. *EDUCATIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES:*

Admission standards, curricula content, degree requirements, grading standards, standards for academic freedom, standards for student conduct and discipline, procedures for the appointment of department chairmen, deans and the president.

B. *PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION:*

Appointments, promotion and tenure, courses assignments, work schedules, work loads, allocation of office space, secretarial help, procedures for handling complaints and grievances.

C. *ECONOMIC ISSUES:*

Budget development, faculty salaries, fringe benefits, sabbatical leaves, building, libraries, departmental allocations, summer and extension employment.

D. *PUBLIC ISSUES AS THEY AFFECT THE FACULTY:*

Education for disadvantaged minority groups, and political interference in the operating of the institution.

E. *THE DEVELOPMENT OF PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY REPRESENTATION:*

Faculty should be involved in the determination of such procedures. The NEA believes that the ultimate condition of faculty negotiations should be the mutual sharing of the governance of college or university affairs based on law or written agreement and free from the adversary relationship which so often appear in bargaining in the private sector. At present all elements of the academic community have some responsibility for enacting the kind of legal machinery which will make the concept of shared responsibility a reality. Administrative staffs and boards of trustees have it within their power to effect the changes which will guarantee the kind of climate needed for a free and secure faculty dedicated not only to the success of their profession, but also to the success of their students in their pursuit of knowledge, maturity, truth and justice.

The NEA commends those administrators and boards of trustees who have had the foresight to enter into agreements with their faculties, but the NEA also advises those who would thwart the truly professional aspirations of their faculties that they do a great disservice both to the profession and the ideal of democratic education.

FACULTY GOVERNANCE AND POLICY-MAKING

CATHERINE A. NOYES

(Fashion Institute of Technology)

The composition of this panel suggests clearly that FIT is represented because of its special situation. Mr. Kugler speaks for the UFCT, Mr. Glasser for the Legislative Conference, Mr. Bennett for the AAUP, and Mr. Keck for the NEA. The fifth wheel obviously speaks as a faculty member of the one public community college in New York City which is not a part of CUNY; a college which was created by an industry, not an educational hierarchy; and a college which although a part of SUNY had no faculty organization until recently, other than an inactive AAUP chapter. Last October FIT secured within twenty-four hours both a signed contract bargained for by the UFCT and an authorized set of bylaws establishing a Faculty Association independent of state or national organizations. The UFCT chapter is concerned with securing conditions under which all FIT faculty, whether union members or not, can contribute best to the educational purposes of the college. The Association establishes the organizational machinery which implements policies established by itself and by the union. The one supplements the other. Committees of the Association are specifically mentioned in the union contract; union policies are specifically mentioned in the bylaws; some faculty members serve on committees of both union chapter and Association; communication among participants is assured.

While it is obvious that FIT faculty have been deeply concerned with the question of faculty governance and policy-making, it is equally obvious that we are rank beginners beside many of you who have been working for years within smoothly functioning organizations. I propose, therefore, to leave details for your questions and I hope suggestions, and to present two points only: the first, a generalization about the power to act, and the second a summary of four practical realities which we have found must be faced if the power to act is to become effective.

The power to govern themselves and to create major educational policies is automatically assumed for many faculties in the liberal arts tradition. This power can operate dramatically, as it did at one of the seven institutions in which I have served. A clique composed of two or three administrators and a few power-hungry faculty members attempted to block progressive change. The clique was voted down after open and democratic discussion — why? Because colleagues trusted the judgment and good faith of the majority. All were equal colleagues, entitled to one vote each, in an enterprise based on principles shared by all, and instructors and major administrators voted together. Unfortunately, however, few two-year colleges have so firmly established and taken-for-granted a tradition of faculty autonomy. Many are responsible to community and state controlling bodies; others may have inherited paternalistic attitudes from generous founders. For most two-year colleges, those who hold the power to govern are not the faculty.

We do not need to point a finger at anyone, but I do plead that we talk frankly. If we claim, and we do, that faculty governance is newly significant, that faculty militancy is growing, surely the reason must be that past governance has been less than ideal? Why, then, do we not say boldly that many presently governing bodies have failed to use their power wisely — to keep pace with change, to plan with student needs paramount, to tap the ideas and insights of their teaching faculty? Curiously, much of what is spoken or written about faculty governance concerns itself with organization and theory only, seldom with the need to win power from hands reluctant to let it go. We rarely mention actual power — the power of administrations which may give lip-service to faculty participation but find it hard to share the power they have so long enjoyed.

Faculty have an obligation here. When the administrators of an educational institution look upon instructors as colleagues, the faculty have earned that judgment. It is unfortunately true that many who deserve to be judged as colleagues are treated like employees, for their administrators may never have heard of a university as a community of scholars — or if they have, may feel such a notion has no relevance to the community college concept. Administrators who turn loyal colleagues into adversaries by decisions which violate academic freedom or individual rights have to be opposed — and with power. Administrative intransigence has provoked on at least one New York campus the kind of union activity which is openly defiant. Collective bargaining is not necessarily belligerent; where good faith has been present unions have a long and honorable history. Their chief concern on college campuses is with working conditions, and their help is sadly needed where paternalism has allowed injustices to persist. An administration which reacts to the word *union* as if were synonymous with violence, strikes, and irresponsible uses of power is creating its own problems, for unions are definitely in the two-year college future. (See Harry A. Marmion, "Unions and Higher Education," *The Educational Record,* Vol. 49, No. 1, Winter, 1968, p. 45.) Such an administration would be well advised to work toward creating an atmosphere of cooperation among colleagues, and can best do so by making sure that a freely elected representative body of faculty can function well — whether it is a senate, a council, an association, or a chapter of one of the nation-wide professional bodies represented on this panel. Administrators would do well, also, to speak out against public ignorance when necessary. How many administrators dependent upon legislative appointment will comment publicly, I wonder, on the remark made by a governor's aide and printed in the May issue of *Harper's* that teachers "are all second-raters" in a second-rate profession?

How many will let their faculties know that they disavow such an opinion?

Faculty have a real task before them. We are prone to say in tones of moral outrage, "I'll fight for my rights!" Should we not instead be demonstrating how a nine-hour class schedule can benefit students, community, and college? The patient merit of the docile schoolmarm who built our educational system at too great a personal cost is no longer relevant, but neither is the sound and fury of the agitator. The self-proclaimed adversary risks losing the right to be recognized as a colleague.

How then is faculty governance to win more than lip-service from those with long-established habits of unilateral decision? By effective proof that only those in daily contact with students can keep the focus of community college education where it ought to be — on the student and the community rather than on building programs and public relations. By slow attrition of the "we've always done it that way" mentality. By insistence that representation on policy-making committees be rigidly honored. By developing articulate leaders at all instructional levels as well as among professors and chairmen. By keeping the perspective wide and vision broad, refusing to be entangled in the petty. By deserving the name of colleague rather than adversary.

Down from the clouds with a bump: what are the practical realities once the power to act has been established? The four I should like to mention briefly are problems, difficulties, genuine hazards — and yet perhaps the emphasis need not become too negative and we can share some possible solutions. No effective faculty governance can be achieved unless all of these problems and many more can be at least partially solved.

The first is communication. This catch-all word has many meanings, from Marshall McLuhan's on down, but here I intend the simplest meaning of all — keeping others informed of what we are doing, thinking, saying, deciding. Does the Curriculum Committee know at its Monday meeting, as it studies the possibility of a new major in biochemistry, that the trustees only the week before authorized their own study of the same possibility? In most institutions I know, it hasn't the faintest idea, so it duplicates effort — or it carries on hours of patient work only to discover six months later that the trustees have voted down the possibility. Does the mail room run short of the mimeographed bulletin so that thirty faculty never hear of the proposed amendment before the meeting convenes? The vote has to be postponed for another month. Do the chairmen recommend to the president a change in course designations and fail to inform the catalogue editor in time to check the final proof for the printer? Does the business office issue a memorandum which ignores a decision made by the Faculty Senate — because Senate minutes are not routed to that office? Are administrative decisions reported promptly and clearly to all faculty? Perhaps most significant, does so much paper flow over every desk that no one can read it all and the weary faculty member is constantly saying, "I never got that notice"? Are bulletin boards available? Are they read? Does interoffice mail circulate rapidly and accurately? Is there messenger service? How about telephones? Do the officers of the Faculty Senate have telephones on their desks? Ah-h! Is Utopia here?

An inevitable corollary of the first point becomes the second: time. Who in the world has time to read and digest all this communication — much less reflect upon it? Twelve or fifteen teaching hours, conferences with students, preparations, corrections, departmental meetings — and that research! When does one find time to bat out that paper for the *Architectural Arts Monthly*? All this is nothing. Wait until the committee-work starts. Any successful participation in policy-making or any pretext of faculty governance involves long hours of committee meetings. When do they get scheduled? How can we get nine faculty and students together without class conflicts? What about the officer who is due three places at once? If a cooperative administration allows committee time to be incorporated into the general schedule, do those who avoid responsibility just goof off while the others are slaving? What do we do about committees if half the personnel is away from the campus on college-sponsored activities? Policy decisions often have to meet deadlines; how can a faculty organization guide policy if it can't even meet?

If you've been in the thick of organizing, as we have, you are already sinking under a heap of paper work. And that's point three — paper work. Talk about practical realities! That meeting notice needs to be on a stencil; the office has no secretary free; is a typewriter available? I'll bat it out on three fingers; what's that? The mimeograph room closed at three? I'm in class tomorrow until 12:00; can you walk it through for me? And so forth. Sometimes the problems of polling a faculty by mail can be overwhelming. That faculty organization is rare which has at its disposal secretarial help whenever it is needed, adequate equipment, and instant clarity and fluency in reducing information to writing. But communication is the lifeblood of faculty governance, communication not only with other faculty but with administration, trustees, and students. Add to these communication with the AAUP, the NEA, the Legislative Conference, the UFCT, the NYSJCA, the Faculty Council of Community Colleges of SUNY, the National Faculty Association of Community and Junior Colleges, the American Council on Education—and you have paper work.

The three practical realities considered so far are bread-and-butter issues, but they will yield to cooperative planning and expenditure of goodwill and some money. FIT, for example, is just now planning to include in its schedule for next year a faculty Common Hour which will make committee meetings infinitely easier to schedule. The fourth reality is tougher. No faculty governance worth the name will take place without the informed and concerned electorate essential to all democracy. Too many faculty members are willing to ride out change secure in their tenure, content with any status quo which does not interfer with their own small worlds. Others couldn't care less; they cherish detachment from what they call "the job." Many who are full of idealistic hopes to begin with are inexperienced in betrayal and unprepared for frustration; they soon lose resilience and shrug their shoulders saying, "You can't fight the system." Some have never understood professionalism; they feel no obligations beyond those stipulated in a contract. Too many are timid. They honestly underrate their own capacities and refuse committee responsibilities for fear of proving inadequate. Others are simply afraid to risk offending those who wield the magic power of tenure and promotion. Then, of course, every large group has within it several good souls who are obstructionists—often for what they consider the best of reasons. The two-year college has an advantage in that its younger instructors are frequently eager to make their mark before they move on—but these same developing leaders are often lost just when their contributions have become especially valuable.

The informed and concerned faculty which will prove an asset in policy-making, which will help the college to contribute to the life of its community, can only be a faculty which trusts and respects its administration and in turn is respected and trusted with power by it. An administration can obstruct the solution of, or help to solve, the problems of communication, time, and paper work. It takes an administration and a faculty working together as colleagues to set the atmosphere which will stimulate more and more faculty members to take an active part in their own governance and in educational policy-making for their colleges.

SUMMARY OF REMARKS OF GENE WELBORN, STATE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE AT BUFFALO AND PRESIDENT OF LOCAL CHAPTER OF AMERICAN FEDERATION OF COLLEGE TEACHERS—

(Substitute for
DR. ISRAEL KUGLER)

Everyone agrees in principle on the necessity for faculty participation in college government; the real question is whether the faculty has the will to take part. Many faculty members are "public-school oriented," and defer as a matter of habit to administrative judgments in policy matters. The machinery of participation varies widely from campus to campus, and includes some very rudimentary devices.

Mutual trust and administrative receptivity are important factors in the development of effective faculty government. Where the willingness to work with faculty and to accord it an effective voice in college governance does not exist, it falls to a small, militant group to insist upon those things. Administrators have been known to follow a number of approaches in resisting faculty claims to share authority. The "autocrat" speaks in terms of "my" faculty, almost in a literal sense, and brooks no attempt to diminish his authority in favor of the faculty. "Big Daddy" tries to deal with a faculty as if instructors and administrators were "one big happy family" (with the president as paterfamilias), rather than a group of adults with occasionally divergent interests who are entitled to be addressed without condescension. The "paternalist" acts unilaterally for the supposed good of those who have been excluded from the making of decisions. The "manipulator" attempts to convey a false impression of participation by providing busywork on secondary matters and diverting attention from crucial issues which should come before the faculty.

Students have some of the same rights as faculty, and according them an appropriate role in the life of the institution is long past due.

Unions are an effective answer to the problems outlined, and have arisen in a variety of situations. Occasionally, a chapter of the AAUP has served as faculty spokesman, or a Faculty Association has attempted to perform this function. Unions have been the only alternative to a failed attempt by such organizations at a reasoned dialogue with the administration of the institution. Thus, the sources of unionism have been practical rather than ideological. The usual machinery of college government is not discarded by it, but must be supplemented by the outside, independent, militant force which a union exerts, and by a negotiated contract.

The handling of grievances supplies an example of the increased effectiveness of faculty under a union. Where traditional grievance procedures are utilized, the faculty member usually procures an internal review of his case by the Faculty Senate, which tends to uphold administrative decisions. Where a union contract is negotiated, it is possible to have an independent external examination of the case under the grievance procedures of the contract.

SUMMARY OF EXTEMPORANEOUS DISCUSSION FOLLOWING PRESENTATION OF PAPERS AT PANEL ON FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN COLLEGE GOVERNANCE

ARTHUR L. GOLUB
Bronx C. C.

The major part of the discussion which followed Miss Noyes's presentation dealt with the impact of collective bargaining on faculty participation in college governance, and the feasibility of alternative modes of bargaining. Miss Noyes's paper was influenced by her experience at an institution which simultaneously created a Faculty Association and entered into a collective bargaining agreement with the United Federation of College Teachers. Accordingly, the discussion and debate often alluded to the situation at Fashion Institute of Technology in New York City.

One group of interchanges explored the conditions leading to the establishment of unions and the relative effectiveness of other kinds of faculty organizations in dealing with college authorities. Some were inclined to agree with Mr. Welborn that the failure of AAUP chapters and faculty associations led to the organization of union chapters and the application of labor union techniques to faculty-administration negotiations. Others agreed with Mr. Bennett that an active AAUP chapter would force an administration to be sensitive to claims for faculty participation in college governance. He suggested that the AAUP develop sanctions in this area, as it already has done in the areas of academic freedom and tenure. In the case of FIT, where the faculty association and the collective bargaining contract emerged at the same time, it was thought that there would be no opportunity to size up the separate impact of the faculty association. Dr. Glasser asserted that unions were not necessary in every case, but only in those instances where the administration was unreachable by other means. He felt that it was possible to develop a pattern of administrative - faculty relationships midway between the "vernal pastures" of the AAUP and the "class warfare" of the AFT.

Another series of questions and answers related to the actualities of existence under a collective bargaining contract. It was asked what would be the role of the faculty — advisory or otherwise — in the light of the normal legal responsibilities of the Board of Trustees and President of the institution? According to FIT faculty present, such authority was respected under their new contractual arrangements. Wherever necessary, faculty representatives sought to arrive at a consensus of opinion with the trustees and president. It was suggested that the presence of union leadership on the Board of Trustees of FIT expedited this easy working relationship.

Was the emphasis on colleagueship voiced by Miss Noyes and other union advocates consistent with the hostility to administrators allegedly characteristic of union leadership? It was suggested that the FIT local's position was more moderate than that of its parent organization. Mr. Mort held that the position of the AFT was not "anti-administrator" but "pro-teacher." What the union was trying to do was to reduce the excessive authority of administrators without curbing their constructive contribution to higher education.

Is the union actually a divisive force, rather than one which contributes to good professional relationships among colleagues? Would college government be a closed shop, controlled by the union? This did not appear to be the case at FIT, where memberships on faculty committees and other responsible bodies were not distributed on the basis of union membership but on the ability to contribute.

A third area of interest was in the practical question whether the militant and forceful tactics characteristic of the unions (but now shared to some degree by other professional organizations) were superior to the lower-keyed approaches more characteristic of the AAUP, the NEA, and other traditionally - oriented faculty organizations. According to Mr. Glasser, the FIT contract, which was supposed to be a model for public community colleges in the New York area, did not contain as good terms as the later schedule for the City University of New York, said to have been negotiated largely by the Legislative Conference of the City University. It was pointed out that the FIT contract contains a clause reopening the salary schedules in the event they were to be exceeded by those of the City University, and that this reopener was already under way. The rejoinder was that this made the City University the pace-setter rather than FIT. The further rebuttal was that the FIT contract was negotiated in 1966-67, prior to the CUNY negotiations, and that the re-negotiated FIT schedules would move ahead of the CUNY schedule.

Was the threat or the use of the strike weapon an effective way of forcing concessions from administrators and trustees? In part, this may depend on the striking organization and its political effectiveness. Mr. Mort pointed out that the Florida teachers strike, led by the NEA, was a failure. On the other hand, the AFT - led Pittsburgh strike, which was coupled with pressures on the Pennsylvania legislature by leaders of powerful allied industrial unions, was a success. Mr. Bennett pointed out that the process of "reasoning together" can be an effective alternative to the employment of pressure. Higher education was conducted in a special milieu, and was the testing point of reason. If more rational means of resolving disputes could not be found there, where could they be employed? Mr. Lawton went further, and asserted that the use of reason is itself a form of power. A united and intelligent faculty could employ methods other than the strike to press for more favorable conditions. He pointed out that in Pittsburgh teacher goals could have been obtained without a strike, which in this case was really employed as an organizing weapon, and had been in preparation long before the actual dispute. Even then, he said, the NEA actually won a majority of the vote in a collective bargaining election.

PANEL II

FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN STUDENT COUNSELING

JEARL L. BLANKENSHIP
Agricultural and Technical College
Alfred

The development of professional counseling and student personnel services as specialized functions at the college level has generated considerable discussion as to what roles and responsibilities are to be assumed by the non-teaching professional staff and their relationship to the long established faculty advisory system. Furthermore, the dialogue has continued with reference to the duties and responsibilities of the faculty advisor in the twenty-four hour day world of the college student that very often extends far beyond matters related to the academic classroom.

Today we often think of counseling as a function performed chiefly by a professional staff, trained as specialist in this particular area. But in the time before the professional counselor had an established role in the college setting, a system of faculty advisors to students had become rather firmly established in many of the colleges in this country. As early as the year 1828 firmly established programs of faculty advisement were instituted in an attempt to bring a reform in the cold strict disciplinary pattern of the presiding educational era. In the establishment of a group of student advisors at Dartmouth College (2:189) in 1919 the following statement outlines the goals this student advisory system hoped to attain as well as the duties and responsibilities of the student advisors.

That it be the function of the advisors to inform themselves regarding the circumstances and character of the students under their supervision, their manner of life and their college work, their antecedents, interests and ideals. That the relations between advisor and student be regarded as friendly and confidential. That advisors meet their students at regular intervals, at the beginning of the freshman year, about once in every two weeks, once toward the end of the freshman year, and again at the end of the first and second semester of the sophomore year for the special purpose of discussing with them the selection of courses for the following semester.

This assignment of teaching faculty to duties related to student needs in areas outside of the academic classroom duly developed into specialized student personnel functions that were designed to meet the needs of students in the non-academic areas of the college environment. However, in this attempt to specialize at the college level to create an educational excellence, the needs of the individual student has not been fully considered.

It appears that in this striving for educational excellence through specialization we have lost contact with the student as an individual person. In too many circumstances the student has become a letter grade in faculty members grade books, an I.B.M. card or a seating chart number. If the colleges of today are going to meet the needs of youth preparing for tomorrow, then out of necessity the adult members of the college community must reestablish lines of communication that will lead to a better understanding of the student as a whole individual. If we are to work with the student as a person we must better understand his goals, drives, motives, and abilities as well as his individual academic strength and weakness.

In order to reestablish a line of communication between the student and his educational program a system of faculty counseling must be instituted in place of the faculty advisory system that in many cases has evolved into little more than a clerical arm of the registrar's office.

The faculty counselor can plan an

important role in the educational guidance of young college students. He has the opportunity to become acquainted with the total individual and because he works with a comparatively small number of students should get to know them well. This knowledge of the student combined with an awareness of special conditions and circumstances that may affect an individual students educational welfare can provide a highly effective system of educational guidance. In addition the student appears to accept the faculty counselor as an educational specialist in his particular area.

Faculty counselors who have been well trained encourages a greater acceptance of the professional counseling service provided by the specialist. But pernaps, the greatest contribution that the faculty counselor can make is to provide for a closer integration of the student and the educational program.

In order to meet the educational needs of our students in the specialized and segmented world that we have created in the name of academic excellence, there may have to be a change made in the organizational pattern and structure of the college campus. This exists today and develop a Faculty Counseling System. If a Faculty Counseling System is to be effective a basic operational philosophy such as one suggested by Feder (1:290) must be adopted, and accepted as an integral part of an institutional educational program.

1. Student counseling is an integral part of the educational program.
2. Use of specially trained and assigned faculty will provide a larger number of varied personalities than would be available if the counseling services were limited to a smaller number of full-time personnel.
3. Inculcation of members of faculty with the personnel point of view will in the long run result in better instruction and a more vital institutional attitude.
4. The faculty counselors will be trained and directed by professional personnel whose training is directly in the field of counseling and who will be responsible for the overall operation of the program including continuing service to the counselors, operation of staff clinics and assistance with difficult cases.
5. The faculty counselors will be given relief from part of their teaching load or extra compensation as recognition by the institution of the value of their efforts.
6. The faculty counselors will be carefully selected in terms of certain basic criteria designed to insure that the most effective personalities are obtained.
7. The faculty counselors will be given recognition for their effectiveness as counselors, as well as for teaching effectiveness, research and writing, when promotions in rank and salary are being considered.
8. Faculty counselors will be given training in minimum essentials before actually being given case assignments.
9. Faculty counselors who prove ineffective or inefficient in counseling duties will be relieved of such duties without jeopardizing their other relationship to the institution.
10. Adequate clerical and secretarial assistance will be provided so that the counselor may use his time as completely as possible in service to students. Appropriate office space will be provided since effective counseling requires an atmosphere of welcome and confidence.

Selected References

1. Williamson, E. G., *Trends In Student Personnel Work*. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1949, pp. 288-98.
2. Williamson, E. G., *Student Personnel Services In Colleges and Universities*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1961, pp. 188-9.

FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN STUDENT COUNSELING "POSSIBLE APPLICATIONS FROM ONE SCHOOL'S EXPERIENCE"

MAX B. FRANC, Ph. D.

Borough of Manhattan
Community College
The City University of New York

For the past two years I have been working with an activity at Borough of Manhattan Community College which may be of interest for your future endeavors to get faculty members involved in student counseling. To date we have concentrated on a centralized advisement facility. It is called the Academic Advisement Service. It has some features that you may want to explore. If such advantages are found attractive, you might later decide to combine some of those features within the framework of the more usual decentralized approach that assigns a given number of students to each regular faculty member.

Availability

How does this concept of "centralized advisement" hit the student? Generally it means that there is one place, physically, to which he can go from nine in the morning to late in the afternoon and where there will be an interested faculty advisor waiting for him. That Academic Advisor is experienced in helping students with problems, questions needs, *etc.* relating to the student's program while at our College

That person is a regular faculty member who also teaches. That faculty member is released from some of his classrooms hours for assignment to that central office for a small number of hours each week. As a regular faculty member, that person has the usual classroom orientation and contact with students. As a member of a 15-man team who is assigned for two or three hours each week to Academic Advisement, that teacher is in the process of developing an expertise and detailed knowledge about a number of varied curricula in our comprehensive community college. If for one of a number of reasons that faculty advisor returns to a full-time teaching load the next semester, I feel that this additional background helps relationships with students in the classroom.

Organization

At present we find it desirable to have one such faculty member present to cover each hour in the Academic Advisement office. Our school has a full-time Day enrollment of approximately 2300 students. The Academic Advisement Service also has a Secretary-Receptionist who, among other things, inserts a record for each student contact in the student's file. The other person is myself, who has the responsibility of supervising and giving continuity to this operation. I report directly to our Dean of Faculty, Edgar D. Draper. In our organizational chart Dean Draper is second in command, coming under our President.

Under Dean Draper are three academic divisions. The faculty advisors have their regular assignments to departments within those divisions. At present approximately 15 faculty members are detailed to a total of 33 hours of coverage of Academic advisement over the week.

Our college also has a Student Life Department which is under the Dean of Students. Specialists in Student Life work with students in the usual kinds of specialized counseling, psychological, financial, and long-term vocational which includes administration of testing instruments. There is referral of students back and forth between Student Life and the Academic Advisement Service. I feel that relationships between the two have worked out smoothly.

Possible Applications

You might wish to adapt some of the features of this system to your own needs at your school. You might wish to make a centralized service available, perhaps on a smaller scale, say for two or three hours a day. The middle of the day might be best, say from 11 to 2 o'clock in the afternoon. I am sure you have heard complaints from students that they cannot locate their faculty advisor when the latter is supposed to be present for office hours in a decentralized advisement system. In the same way, faculty members complain, as they did in our College before our centralized Academic Advisement Service, about the great difficulty of locating their student advisees.

A centralized service of this kind might be a good transitional development, lasting over say a two- or three-year period. It could help lay a base for organizing more intensive faculty involvement in student counseling. The relatively small number of Academic Advisors for this centralized team would hopefully be drawn from the more conscientious faculty members who have a "feel" for this kind of work. As they work together in evolving an expertise, both in terms of information and advisement technique, the benefits of their efforts should in time be brought back to their regular academic departments.

In our College, this has paid off in terms of informational materials, to say the least. In many cases our Academic Advisors have been able to pin down what had previously been somewhat informal and at time irregular practices. Our Academic Advisors have worked together to develop Curriculum Planning Worksheets that have been helpful to both students and teachers. We are now in a better position to identify more things which turn out to be somewhat more routine, such as ways of checking the student's orderly progress toward his degree. Some problems turn out to call for some intensive ways of working out advisement techniques. The latter pertain for example to student's desires to change their curriculum, as well as special needs of students for remedial work in order to prevent their falling into probation or dismissal status.

Providing Service to Students

The criterion for any system of advisement or counseling is the extent to which it moves in the direction of providing services for students. You would have to hold a centralized service such as I am recommending against that same measure. The important thing is to be open to trying new things. In junior colleges we sometimes expend more energy raising objections than getting to the stage of taking the new steps. There are some things, therefore, that I feel we should spend less time worrying about.

One of those misplaced emphases has to do with overconcern that the teacher from one subject area should advise only in that area. My experience is that the conscientious faculty member soon makes it his business to know a lot of details about a great variety of areas. When he should send the student to someone else, he tends to do so.

Another false concern has to do with the idea that all students should desire or seek out counseling or advisement. Some students simply will never be "brought around" in this connection, and this fact should be accepted. In the main, students who need academic advisement seek it out once the facility becomes known by students for services rendered.

In the same vein, some faculty members in the College are not good at this kind of work nor does it seem that they will every be interested. This too should be accepted. Decreased teaching load for faculty members in the school who are most serious about such work should be explored.

Some academic departments prefer to rotate this duty among all members, others wish to cultivate one or two departmental "specialists" in student counseling. Both systems can be worked with and put to the advantage of students and school.

Academic Advisors should be encouraged to explore their own techniques with respect to what is effective with students. I find that, in addition to exhibiting considerable inventiveness, most Advisors are very open to picking up and absorbing effective techniques from other Advisors.

Identifying those faculty members who are most conscientious about this kind of work and then genuinely listening to them will go a long way. If the centralized service emphasizes that the student should always be encouraged to deal as directly as possible with the classroom teacher, there will be few problems here in terms of lack of tact or other possible sources of friction. Greatest emphasis should be on getting the student into contact with as many faculty people as possible. The conscientious Advisor tends not to step on people's toes. He develops a sense for this sort of thing. Having "good people" work on common projects such as jointly dealing with probation students also speeds up development of new techniques for the benefit of the College as a whole.

The Future

We hear that the junior college is coming of age. I hope you will explore new ways of getting faculty members in our colleges more "involved" in student counseling and advisement. I would be very interested in comparing notes with you about this subject in the future.

"FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN STUDENT COUNSELING"

JOHN C. GRAF
Staten Island Community College

Should faculty be involved with student counseling? The answer has to be "YES". For as teachers, whether we realize it or not, we are already involved; not necessarily as professionally trained guidance counselors, but as professionally trained educators.

Teaching implies counseling, which, according to Webster's dictionary is: "the use of psychological methods in testing the interests of and giving professional guidance to individuals."

I am particularly interested in counseling as it relates to the functions of a teacher. And as a member of the faculty of Staten Island Community College, I can tell you something about our involvement in student academic guidance.

We operate in three ways:

First, . . . In a Curricular Advisory Program for entering Freshmen,

Second, . . . As Faculty Advisors for upper classmen,

Third, . . . As Course and Standing Advisors for students in academic difficulty.

Let's take a closer look at each of these faculty involvements:

First, the Curricular Advisory Program:

At least one faculty member from each teaching department participates in a formal consultation program, with a token reduction in classroom hours. The coordination of the program is the responsibility of a Counselor in the Department of Student Personnel who also serves as liaison between that department and the Academic Dean.

The primary objective of the formal interviews, which are conducted at regularly scheduled hours, is to guide the student toward his academic goal, and to establish rapport with a particular faculty member. If, during the interview concerning academic directions, it becomes apparent that testing, or more specialized guidance is advisable, referral is made to the Department of Student Personnel for professional counseling.

Secondly, As Faculty Advisors for upper classmen:

Other faculty members, in addition to a full teaching schedule, help sophomores in matters of program planning and other related areas.

Thirdly, Course and Standing Advisors for students in academic difficulty:

The departmental faculty member of the college's committee on Course and Standing advises all students who are placed on academic probation.

I, myself, am involved on the first two levels — as a curricular advisor for freshmen in one phase of the business curriculum, and as a faculty advisor to a small group of upper-classmen in the business program. Other members of the department serve as faculty advisors to upper classmen; still another serves both as a curricular advisor and Course and Standing advisor.

There are two thoughts worth injecting at this point:

First, that follow-up is essential.

Second, that we must not try to play God.

Admittedly, many of us have neither the time, nor the opportunity to become professionally trained counselors if we are keeping pace with our academic disciplines. But we must nonetheless remember that counseling cannot be a one-shot, sometime affair. In the interests of better teaching, we should be able to take the time to spot students with difficulties and do something constructive. This does not necessarily mean that we must spoon-feed, or coddle students. It does mean that in addition to any formal guidance program we should always be involved with and empathetic to the students we're teaching.

How we accomplish this is likely to differ among faculty members, and it is not the intent of this paper to come up with any individual sure-fire techniques. The best I can do is to tell you some of the things I have learned as a result of my academic guidance and teaching experience at Staten Island Community College.

For example:

1. To my dismay, I have discovered that some faculty members couldn't care less about the student as an individual.
2. Similarly, I have learned that many students couldn't care less about either their college teachers or a guidance program.
3. I have observed that a significant number of entering students are completely unprepared for the immediate adjustments they must make to college. What's more, they're just plain scared.
4. In addition to running scared, many of these students aren't really certain as to why they are in college or where they are going!
5. Those who have strong reasons for being in college are often preconditioned to curriculum to which they are ill-suited. Others are carrying program loads not compatible with their ability or previous record.
6. It is surprising how many students and even some faculty members fail to read college bulletins, handbooks and regulations carefully.

So much, for the moment, on the negative side. There are a few observations on the bright side of the picture.
For instance:

1. Students who respond to the initial interview in the formal Curricular Advisory Program tend to make it a habit to see the advisor regularly.
2. When the faculty advisor is readily accessible, the rapport develops smoothly and positively.
3. When, through effective guidance, students find their academic directions, they perform on a higher level, and show more concern for their achievement.
4. There is a noticeable, effective change in student attitudes with the development of the student-faculty relationship.

Has the Staten Island Community College program been successful?
Yes . . . and then again . . . No.

. . . To the extent that faculty resistance has been effectively reduced .... probably NO.

. . . To the extent that students — particularly those who need it most — respond fully to formal interviews or casually to occasional informal sessions ...... probably NO.

. . .To the extent that all academic problem areas are discovered, investigated, and resolved ..... undoubtedly NO.

. . . To the extent that all students in need of academic guidance are actually reached .... probably NO.

. . . To the extent that realistic reduction in faculty teaching loads is allowed in order to maximize faculty involvement in guidance .. undoubtedly NO.

. . . To the extent that adequate secretarial service and other administrative implementation is provided ..... probably, NO.

BUT . . .

. . . To the extent that many students have been salvaged and given academic direction who might otherwise have dropped-out, tuned-out, or failed out .. YES.

. . . To the extent that more academic information is exchanged directly, relevantly, on a personal basis .... YES.

. . . To the extent that both students and faculty become more knowledgeable about the college academic programs . YES.

. . . To the extent that many students have developed a viable rapport with individual faculty members .... YES.

. . . To the extent that many more faculty members have developed an interest in academic guidance and the resultant feedback .... YES.

. . . To the extent that a beginning has been achieved ....
DEFINITELY . . . YES!

Should an academic guidance program exist in a two-year community college?
.... emphatically, YES

Should the faculty be involved in an academic guidance program in a two-year community college?
....
again,
emphatically YES!

NOTES AND REMARKS

JOHN W. KELLEY

Corning C.C.

Panel II, "Faculty Involvement is Student Counseling," participants were Moderator Dr. Vera F. Minkin, Bronx Community College; Assistant Moderator Mr. Jack C. Van Newkirk, Ulster Community College; and panelists Dr. Jearl L. Blankenship, Clinical Psychologist, SUNY College at Alfred; Dr. Max B. Franc, Borough of Manhattan Community College; Mr. John C. Graf, Staten Island Community College. Recorder for the session was John W. Kelley, Corning Community College.

Represented in the audience for Panel II were SUNY at Stonybrook, St. Regis College, Fulton-Montgomery Community College, Bronx Community College, University of Buffalo, Mohawk Valley Community College, Onondaga Community College, Villa Maria College, Fashion Institute of Technology, Paul Smith College, Bennett College and Niagara Community College.

During the first session which met from 3:45 to 5 p.m. on April 26, three papers were presented by the members of the panel.

The Panel decided to present our three papers during the first session and devote the second session completely to questions, answers, and discussion.

The second session convened at 10:15 a.m. and continued until noon on Saturday, April 27, during which the following discussion occurred. The discussion began with comments by Mr. Bruce Walters of Fulton-Montgomery College who seemed to agree with Dr. Franc's presentation regarding the centralized advising center. At the present time Fulton-Montgomery has eleven faculty members in this type of a centralized program with an approximate ratio of 57 to 1. This program consists of graduation worksheets for the seven curriculums offered at that particular college. Mr. Walters felt that these graduation worksheets were most effective. He brought up the problem of the one to one ratio of release time which gave faculty members a way of getting out of classroom duties. He stated that during the first semester the sessions tended to last 15 minutes per student per week, but the student flow seemed to decrease during the second semester. In addition to Fulton-Montgomery's centralized advising program, they also have a strong admissions pre-frosh type program with testing, counseling and so on. A question was asked at this point regarding how advising loads for the various programs were equalized? For example, humanities and social science might be a very popular program and the drafting might be a sparsely populated program. How do you equalize the advising loads so that the advisors of popular programs are not doubled up as far as advisees? The only constructive answer offered to this particular problem was that it would be necessary to go out of a curriculum area and train a person in another program. As a result of this discussion, it was recommended that a two-man educational team be set up at the initial matriculation into the particular school that would remain together throughout the student's stay on campus.

The representatives from Fashion Institute of Technology brought out the fact that their students seek out their own advisors. He, however, qualified his statements by saying that there was initial assignment, and then the students were allowed to shift according to their preferences. The advisors at Fashion Institute of Technology had no reduction in class load as a result of being involved in that student advising program. Questions were raised about the training necessary in order to have a good Blankenship faculty advisor. Dr. Blankenship included the following areas as being those in which the faculty advisor should be trained: A. Total profile of the student body; B. Psychological techniques; C. Counseling techniques; D. Test interpretations; E. Work opportunities; and F. Course facts.

Another question was under what area should counseling advisement fall? It was felt that it should not fall under one area, rather it should come under the jurisdiction of both the faculty and student personnel. Otherwise, you would have the segmented-student problem again. With this particular type of faculty and student personnel involvement it is most important for the referral flow to be easily initiated. Another question — What do you do if you cannot get equalization of advisors for a particular program? — the conclusion reached was that it was necessary for the administrative structure of an institution to step in and make an administrative judgment.

In summation it was felt that there were definite merits in the centralized advising program, but I feel that the general consensus of the group was that the Blankenship approach was the most effective. The half-faculty member, half-counselor seemed to allow one person to become familiar with the total student instead of a segment of the student.

PANEL III
FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN COMMUNITY SERVICES

FRANK A. CIPRIANI
Farmingdale

Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. I am delighted to have the opportunity to be with you again today. Our topic for discussion which is faculty involvement in community services is one which appears to me to be a bit incongruous for those of us involved in the matter of higher education, especially those of us in the two year and community college, for what can be more of a community service than education itself?

Previous speakers have discussed the various aspects of community college growth and of some of the programs that are now being developed or are actually underway at many of the community colleges. I agree with Mrs. Domlaurie that C.C. should not stand for carbon copy. Indeed some of the greatest educational innovations of the past twenty years have come from the two year colleges. Because the community college movement in New York State is comparatively new, it is not incumbered by some of those traditions of many of our older sister institutions of higher learning which might be classified as foolish consistencies of which Emerson spoke as being the hobgoblin of little minds. Because of this, there is probably greater hope and a more definite chance of succeeding in community service projects at the community college level than might be the case at older and more established institutions.

I believe that the community college can offer more than the run of the campus program with the Middle-State's approved fare of neatly arranged programs leading to well deserved parchments. Before I go further, please let me underscore my own conviction that all of that must come first. This is the raison d'etre of our colleges and is a formidable goal. It is our "bag", to use a colloquialism of our contemporary younger generation.

But our bag has to be far more comprehensive than it was, and the marvel of it all is that the bag can be as limitless as human resource, skill, intellect and compassion will permit. All of this can be found on every campus in this state. The challenge is to put it in motion in a direction other than the simple joys of academia. There is a challenge and in my view a mandate for our college communities to become involved in every way possible, not just with our immediate neighbors, but with our neighbors in the cities and the slums; those of all ages from the pre-schooler right through to the retired citizen.

How does a college faculty become involved in community service? A college *is* its faculty and so faculty involvement in community service usually begins with college involvement in the community. It is important, I believe, at the very outset that the college should have no fences around it. I don't mean the physical fence of steel or stone but the philosophical and psychological fence which separates the town from the college. Dean Lauter has spoken of some of the various ways in which extension services and continuing education have acted as a catalyst between the college and the community. There are, of course, many other ways, probably as numerous as the number of faculty and administrators on the campus.

The other way is for the community to come to the college to seek help. This is as desirable a route as the other, but less likely to bring as many opportunities for service. This is due to the fact that the college knows better than the community what it can offer. One is amazed to learn the great myths which its own college has conjured in the minds of its neighbors of all levels of sophistication. For many people college goals have always seemed difficult or unattainable, and the campuses inhabitants equally far removed from immediate interaction.

One of the main purposes of this panel is to explore ways in which the college community can become involved in community service. I will not presume to give you a formula or checklist of do's and don't's. I fully subscribe to Kahlil Gibran's *Prophet* who spoke of the teacher and said:

> "If he is indeed wise he does not bid you enter the house of his wisdom, but rather leads you to the threshold of your own mind".

Therefore, allow me to tell you of some of the ways in which our house at Farmingdale has become involved in community service, and perhaps they may suggest a threshold for your own circumstances.

To begin with the college at Farmingdale has always developed advisory committees for every curriculum major which offers a degree at the college. These advisory committees are made up of business and professional men, industrialists and community leaders who have both a keen interest and a professional competence in the areas in which they are to advise. We do not stop with the formation of the advisory committee or with the inception of a curriculum program. Indeed this is when the work really begins. The faculty and the department chairmen meet with the advisory committees at the college as often as they deem necessary. In some cases it is only once a year. In other cases it is as many as ten times a year. With these groups of individuals working in the professional areas concerned, it is possible for the college to recognize the community needs and to react to them with a minimum of lost motion between the recognition of the problem and the proposal of a solution. The advisory committee system has worked well at Farmingdale and has continued to bear fruit as well in the final placement of students at graduation. These same committee members have proved to be of extreme value when they turn their attention to community problems.

Recently a member of our aircraft operations technology advisory committee — an executive with a large airline — became involved in a poverty program project in the Bedford Styvesant section of Brooklyn. This man — a pilot and director of community relations for the company — asked us to help him with his project — 70 miles away. We immediately contacted the community college in the area — more precisely — Dean Victor Lauter — and arranged for a meeting. Currently a training program in engine maintenance has developed using local resources and we were able to promise delivery of two surplus jet engines for the class. This was a stopgap measure and plans are now underway to provide a more comprehensive and meaningful educational experience — with the promise of jobs in private industry for those qualifying after completion of the program.

The meeting with Vic Lauter revealed that we had a mutual concern in working with slum area children. Vic and I blocked out a plan whereby the dormitory facilities at Farmingdale would be made available to the youngsters from the New York City Community College area for an 8 week vacation study and recreation experience — 70 miles away from the long hot summer.

At almost the same time or shortly thereafter, the presidents of Farmingdale, New York City Community College and Manhattan Community College were at a conference in Boston.

They thought that this type of program would be worth exploring and agreed to look further into it. Although we had not consulted with them, we had all arrived at a similar conclusion — which is always a happy rarity. We are now concluding plans to accommodate 150 men and women, whom we hope we can begin to lead to the "thresholds of their own minds".

Interinstitutional cooperation is a potent force in community service. I look forward to greater and increasingly meaningful interaction between our suburban resident colleges with the urban community college.

Other local programs have been developed where we reacted directly to a request from one of the towns in Suffolk County to recommend beautification and rehabilitation of two districts which were beginning to deteriorate. Two of our landscape architects were told of the problem and they agreed to make recommendations. The results of their reports led the town to appropriate funds for a local contractor and landscaper to make improvements according to the guidelines recommended by our faculty representatives. There was more paint and curbing in their suggestions than plants, but the community has benefitted and the effects have been contagious.

Time does not permit my going into all of the wide variety of programs which we have planned, or executed, or have currently underway. The college has a very strong stock of peoplepower in its faculty, students, and staff and physical resources as well. Because one of our strongest commodities is ideas, we are best able to suggest new and imaginative solutions to old drudging problems.

We have had current and constant contact with the directors of recreation in most of the towns of Nassau and Suffolk Counties on whose border the campus is located. In the fie of recreation, as an example, one o our advisory committee members a prominent architect in the area, is lso interested in the development of rks and recreational facilities for the unty generally. Through his efforts we have been able to begin work o an ambitious five year project whic we hope will become a program, pe nanent only to the point where we pe it will eliminate itself as a need. We hope to start with young high s ool dropouts or high school seniors ho have no job career potential nd through the efforts of the town, the ob Corps, the Office of Economic Op prtunity, the Department of Health, ducation and Welfare, the resource of the college, with the community involvement of the faculty working nd and hand with the community inv vement of the students, we will be le to bring these young men and wo en into a meaningful kind of learning xperience.

This semester alone, there are st 40 community service projects u rway serving not only the econom ally disadvantaged individual but so the small businessman, local indu y, the elderly, and the government ker.

It is important for the individual culty member to recognize the p er he represents in the community. rther, it is important for him to pa cipate actively in helping to define d present solutions to these problem It would probably be the best of ll worlds if the hierarchy of our coll es and universities could find a wa to meet the faculty halfway in provi g additional time through reduced kloads to insure meaningful parti ation in community work. We at F ningdale are working toward this al, but will not be content to sit back d wait for the god of the budget to st his blessings upon us. When that he comes it will simply mean an acceleration of the pace we have been setting.

I suppose the key word in all of this is *concern* or the sense of *obligation*. I am reminded of the passage in a novel by Stephen Crane in which a man says to the universe:

"Sir, I exist"!

However, the universe replied, "The fact raises in me no sense of obligation".

No intelligent person or institution can assume the attitude that the universe accepts in this statement. When a man says to us "Sir, I exist", our reply should, in fact, raise in us a sense of obligation.

HORIZONS

MRS. DOM LAURIE
Niagara C.C.

Should the initial letters of Community College be synonymous with those of *Carbon Copy*, or should they represent something entirely different; i.e., should Community Colleges reproduce on a lesser scale the physical features and scholastic philosophies of the larger colleges, or seek an ideology that is consonant with the title?

We are naturally influenced by what has proved successful in the past, and since few of us have had any undergraduate experience in Community Colleges, we're prone to accept as models those autonomous Alma Maters that, in providing separate food, shelter, education, and culture, have perpetuated the medieval tradition of "town and gown." Of course there are exceptions. Some colleges interact with their surroundings, but these are generally located in areas where they are the major business, or local cultural services are inadequate. Where rival industries, businesses, or cultural groups exist, the dichotomy between "town and gown" becomes evident. In any case, the college dominates its district by molding tastes and opinions, and requiring doctoral degrees and publication credits in lieu of position, wealth, or whatever else determines social status. But we cannot blame localities for being influenced, when we educators are equally guilty.

There was a period when the two-year schools might have been excused for following the dictates of colleges and universities. When SUNY organized in 1948, the six Agricultural and Technical, and five Applied Arts and Science Institutes may have been overpowered by the prestigious University Centers, Medical Centers, and four-year units. Since then the situation has changed. The Community Colleges, which began with the Jamestown and Orange County establishments in 1950, have grown to twenty-nine, and even without their six sister "Ag. and Tech." Colleges, have the larger schools surrounded and outnumbered. If there is valid reason, then, it would seem a propitious moment to break with tradition and formulate a new set of objectives.

On the surface, separate goals do not appear necessary; regardless of size, the microcosms of SUNY have pledged themselves to help each student" . . . become all he is capable of being." In practice, however, conditions differ. Associate degree schools have only four semesters to bring aspirants from the point where most couldn't pass the entrance requirements of four-year institutions, to a level where they can pursue careers or compete with select Juniors and Seniors. And not all of the Community College youths are fresh from high school. In the Day Divisions alone, students range from comparatively knowledgeable teenagers to adults who have long forgotten basic facts. The Evening Divisions attempt more herculean labors by admitting anyone willing to pay the fees, regardless of scholastic preparation.

Schools that grant Bachelor and graduate degrees can choose the best scholars in the State, while Community College selections are comparatively limited. We're accustomed to an indigenous student body, one comprised of those who spring from academically barren ground and need extensive remedial work; who are intelligent under-achievers or late bloomers; who failed to meet the requirements of previous colleges and wish a second chance; or those who either cannot afford four years of tuition and residence, or desire career programs only offered by "Associate" schools.

Unlike larger colleges, we have no dormitories. Our scholars come from the offices, factories, and kitchens of the surrounding area and return to them after classes. Because they are commuters who retain their local interests, our colleges find it impossible to withdraw from the communities; nor would we wish to, so long as funds to build and maintain facilities come in part from local governments. For us, therefore, "town and gown" are inseparable and indivisible.

Our Associate Colleges have been remarkably successful in meeting the needs of the "towns". In a few short years, our faculties have become noted for preparedness and effectiveness in the classroom, giving personal attention to students, and remedial teaching on a one-to-one basis. Certainly the faculties have had assistance. Foresighted administrators, in scheduling classes of reasonable size, have enabled teachers to spend time with the students, as well as serve on college committees, attend regional and State convocations, meet with elementary through secondary school educators to discuss academic problems, and businessmen and industrialists to explore the occupational needs of the area.

Such worthy endeavors should be continued, yet there seems to be an ever-growing inclination to replace them with the doctoral requirement and the "publish or perish" mandate. No matter how much respect we hold for the Ph.D. degree, the fact remains the universities are rewarding them not on the basis of teaching ability, but on success in the publishing field. But publication does not necessarily imply good teaching; to the contrary, when publication is obligatory, teaching is apt to suffer, because the faculty is too busy writing papers to prepare lectures. If there is one pitfall the Community Colleges should avoid, it is this. The strength of two-year schools lies in exceptional teaching; the remedial nature of the work demands it, and faculty and administrators should consider it their first responsibility to those who support them. Individuals who pursue higher degrees or submit works *of value* to the journals are to be commended, but shouldn't be coerced into doing so, if it means neglecting the education of as many as possible. And education of the many has never been more important. So long as the least American holds the power of life and death over our Presidents and Kings, our society is in danger. No matter how skillfully we weave the warp and woof of the social fabric, if the basic threads are faulty, they will break under the stress of life to leave us bereft of law and order and thereby naked to our enemies. Let us not be tempted by degrees and publication credits to forget our primary purpose — the building of stronger citizens through education. We encounter little of the academic "cream." We're working with the raw milk, and it behooves us to see it does not turn sour before it is "sold" to the public.

How, then, can we be judged, if not by the standards of larger colleges?

There are numerous ways. We can succeed by initiating new curricula and courses that fit the *needs of the community*, although we may have to make some compromises, for average citizens, and especially politicians, are more impressed with a multiplicity of career programs than with Liberal Arts. Yet this is temporary; given enough basic education, people demand, the Liberal Arts.

We can also support college affairs and encourage friends and neighbors to do likewise, but most important, we can totally involve ourselves in the everyday activities of the area. Possible means of involvement include working hand-in-hand with existent cultural organizations, to the point of foregoing separate facilities at the outset, if required. The good will we build in the community is adequate compensation for our sacrifices. Niagara County Community College is a case in point. As a new unit, NCCC lacks many facilities older colleges take for granted. An auditorium is one, but we fortunately have a faculty member on the Board of the Niagara Falls Little Theater, and she, Mrs. Griebner, persuaded the Directors to lend their stage to the NCCC dramatic club. In return, Mr. Miller and his Stagecrafters (although they weren't required to do so) have built sets, cleaned the theater innumerable times, and supplied actors for local productions, between their own successful shows. Because of their cooperativeness, the Stagecrafters have established a rapport .with Little Theater members that should last long after our college has its own housing.

In addition to working with existing groups, we can explore areas of need in the College. Many students require employment, and NCCC hopes to initiate a program which will allow them to work for the Community Chest, the YMCA, and other non-profit enterprises. Both students and organizations would benefit from such an arrangement.

We can further explore areas of need in the community. When NCCC's Mr. Race, discovered there were children in Niagara Falls who couldn't cope with their grade and high school subjects, he assembled fifty Community College students who, despite studies, jobs, and family responsibilities, teach the youngsters at least once a week.

These examples are not cited because they are unique, newsworthy, or in any way superior to those offered by other colleges, but because they show how faculty can serve a community.

Another possibility is for individuals to join civic, religious, or political organizations and thereby contact taxpayers, newsmen, businessmen, and county officials who can provide support — oral and financial — for the college. The benefits accruing from such involvement are numerous. Taxpayers find its hard to refuse personal acquaintances or friends, and politicians are inclined to grant concessions to power blocs, or groups whose members might oppose them for office.

Total involvement is naturally difficult. Tachers may lack time to join non-academic organizations if they are working for degrees; or money to participate, since salary schedules in new colleges are low; or contacts, if they live outside the county; but these personal problems should eventually resolve themselves. The educational drawbacks are apt to be of longer duration. Faculties that form close ties with a community may be pressured to maintain the *status quo* of an area, when the real need is to be "shakers and movers" who can train students to live in a rapidly changing world; but unless faculties communicate regularly, how will local citizens ever understand the aims and purposes of *modern* education?

There are too many intellectual and

physical differences between two and four-year schools for the younger to blindly follow the elders' lead. The "Ivied Towers" (Ivory Towers being a thing of the past in this age of student activism) are for those who have proven themselves intellectually capable; the Community Colleges, on the other hand, are often "academic proving grounds." The "Ivied Towers" can afford to be Medieval centers of learning which ignore their surroundings; Community Colleges cannot divorce themselves financially or educationally from their districts. And the types differ even in appearance. The nucleus of the Community College is often a complex of invitingly low buildings situated on former farmlands. Its Division Units, especially the Evening Division, are frequently located in major cities or town; its mobile units travel to where the educational "action" is, whether this be industrial plant or village; and its student groups train in local hospitals, dental offices, and even garages.

Because of the proliferation of the Community schools, the educational landscape is changing. Advanced students may still lift their eyes unto the "Ivied Towers," but the bulk of the population seeks the Community Colleges — those fertile fallouts of the explosion of knowledge which have settled in bits and pieces over entire districts, as far as the eye can see and even beyond the horizon. Such unique institutions deserve to be something more than pallid reflections of their predecessors. COMMUNITY COLLEGES require their own aims and objectives — chief among them an educational philosophy which values service to the community above Ph.D. Degrees and publication credits — if they are to LIVE UP TO THE NAME!

THE GOWN GOES TO TOWN

DEAN VICTOR LAUTER

NYC

I have limited my remarks today to the consideration of faculty involvement in community service. In order to give perspective to what I shall be saying, let me quickly give you a brief philosophical and historical point of reference as it applies to my institution, the New York City Community College.

In view of rapid and continuing changes in technology, the acceleration of automation, and the impact of cybernation, it is now widely held that economic man, in order to remain contributory, must prepare for several kinds of jobs during his work life. He must, therefore, continually return to school, or have school come to him, in order for him to keep up with the "new knowledge." There is also agreement that the complexity of domestic and international problems, and the pervasiveness of ambiguities in our political and civic affairs, call for more facts and information, for re-examination of values, and for a greater understanding of current issues, if social man is to shape his destiny positively.

That this "continuing education" function is appropriate for a college is stated unequivocally by Chancellor Gould of the State University of New York:

"It is my conviction that a college, in addition to its more readily accepted intellectual dimension, should have the dimension of community that offers a place for the general life enrichment of all who live nearby: young and old, artisan and farmer and member of a profession, college graduate and comparatively unschooled. Thus many of the gaps or weaknesses that the new pressures of numbers are

2

bound to create in formal education can be filled or strengthened as a college opens its doors and its resources to all in a friendly and informal fashion, without thought of credits or degrees or anything more than to assist the burgeoning of understanding in the individual as a member of a personal, physical, political, economic, artistic, and spiritual world."1)

The New York State Board of Regents, in their statement on objectives of the Community Colleges, goes beyond the philosophical and mandates that these colleges must:

". . . provide programs of continuing education . . . to assist adults of all ages to meet changing educational, cultural, and economic conditions, and to implement changes in their personal objectives."

The New York City Community College has a long history of commitment to this objective and a significant record of accomplishment. Programs have been developed with one purpose uppermost in mind: to provide opportunities for personal and community growth and improvement whenever and wherever the needs existed, to the extent that the College had the resources to deal effectively with them. However, the bulk of the College's resources could not be made available to large, ever-increasing segments of the population with unmet needs, since these resources were utilized on a priority basis for meeting the needs of degree-seeking youth. As these latter needs are being increasingly met by the rapid expansion of two-year degree opportunities, and as continuing education needs become more acute, the College now finds itself in the position where it can and must direct a significant portion of its energies and resources towards the fulfillment of its long held commitment.

The segments of the population — the "Communities," as it were — having needs which are largely unmet, may be arbitarily categorized in gross may be arbitrarily categorized in gross groupings: governmental agencies, unions, private industry, the professions, the disadvantaged, and the elderly. Utilizing its demonstrated capabilities, its sensitivity to community needs, its flexibility and creativity in meeting these needs, and, most important, its commitment to the concept of college-community involvement for service, the New York City Community College, in September, 1966, established a Division of Continuing Education and Extension Services to give meaning, thrust, and the viable tools required to implement this commitment.

Let me get now to the idea at hand: the involvement of traditional faculty in college service to the community. There are a number of pre-conditions which were met in order to secure this involvement in a meaningful and substantial way.

The Division is viewed as a vital component of the College and stands as a peer with the College's degree granting organism. Its needs for staff, space, and finances are considered jointly with those of the other components of the College. An organizational framework has been developed to provide structural support for current programs and a mechanism for the implementation of new programs, as the need for them crystallizes.

The professional administrative staff is currently composed of a Dean, an Assistant Dean, a Program Coordinator, a Coordinator of Projects, and four Project Directors, most of whom have faculty rank. In addition, a flexible approach to staffing Continuing Education programs by exchanging degree faculty with funded positions

---

1) "The Dimensions of a College," address delivered to an Antioch College Assembly, Yellow Springs, Ohio, October 9, 1956.

provides an additional feed-back mechanism for increasing numbers of the traditional faculty to become aware of and familiar with our programs. As a result of this increasing awareness, new program ideas, *new funding sources* and new relationships with the various communities we serve emerge even from traditional faculty. An accepting atmosphere, flexibility in approach, and rapid implementation of ideas also help in encouraging faculty involvements.

In my remaining few minutes I would like to describe for you several current programs involving our traditional faculty in additional or detached services.

Approximately 40 courses which we characterize as our curricular-based program — so named because they are closely related to degree programs — are administered by a full-time professional staff member known as a program coordinator. Part-time area coordinators who are responsible for similar groupings of courses and the faculty teaching these courses is composed largely of members of our traditional staff.

A Title I project known as the Building Inspectors Training Program is administered at an off-campus site by a senior professor from our Construction Technology Department. The part-time staff he uses is again largely composed of members of our full-time faculty.

Our Dietary Aide Training Program, in which we up-grade over 300 Dietary Aides in 19 New York City hospitals, is administered by a full-time member of our Hotel Technology Department.

Our Adult Development Program, which was conducted in cooperation with the South Brooklyn Community Progress Center, is an interesting variation of our approach. In this program 20 disadvantaged adults with poor work histories were assigned individually to an equal number of professional and non-professional staff members at the College for purposes of socialization, on-the-job training and basic remediation. By carefully matching these two groups of individuals we have discovered not only great leaps forward by the served individuals, but also a tremendous growth in understanding by our faculty. Several trainees have resumed their formal education, several have secured entry level positions at the College and all have benefited from their relationship with warm and accepting human beings in a non-competitive atmosphere.

Three Vocational Education Act grants are funding programs for Supervisory Housekeepers, Dental Technologists, and Mechanical Technologists. These part-time programs are administered and taught by full-time faculty of the College.

Time does not permit me to enumerate like programs we are offering to a wide array of agencies of the city government, to unions and to industry in which the faculty is involved.

Our plans for the future call for the exploration, by interested members of our faculty, of adult associate degree programs serving the unique needs of the mature. We are exploring the development of a counselling service for the community as well as a consultation service for industry.

It is our feeling that this rich resource in the community — the Community College — must expand its services to the citizenry in new and creative ways if we are to resolve our crucial social problems, and the richest resources our colleges have are our faculties.

I am sure there are other ways by which the gown can go to town, but our way has been found effective for us.

SUMMARY OF PANEL III, FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN COLLEGE AND COMMUNITY SERVICES—

ADA CATALDO

Staten Island C.C.

A. The Friday afternoon session included the presentation of papers by Frank A. Cipriani of Suny College at Farmingdale, Mrs. Dom Laurie of Niagara County Community College, and Victor Lauter of New York City Community College. Emery Link, of the State University of New York, the 4th panelist and Paul A. Chambers of Broome Technical Community College, recorder, were unable to attend the conference. Both sessions were moderated by Dr. Malcolm H. Forbes of Cazenovia College, and Ada C. Cataldo of Staten Island Community College acted as recorder for both sessions.

During the discussion period which followed, the question was raised as to what were the Community colleges doing for the bright student enrolled in the Community colleges in order to generate in them a feeling of social responsibility. Most current programs appear to be geared toward the disadvantaged student. Farmingdale College has two programs currently in progress with a focus on developing social awareness in the bright student. The first is a (Big Brother) program in which a disadvantaged student is given an advantaged student as a room mate. In addition the disadvantaged student is given a big brother (a famous person) for social status. A second program at Farmingdale has Phi Beta Kappa students adopting a Community, and then tutoring the disadvantaged students in that Community.

B. The Saturday morning session included the presentation of a paper by Assistant Moderator, Peter J. Caffrey of Bronx Community College who bravely agreed to substitute for the missing 4th panelist with a talk on the topic under consideration.

The discussion that followed was much livelier than the Friday session. One question raised, thrust to the heart of the topic, ie; How does the College involve individual faculty members in college and community services?

Some possible suggestions which emerged from the discussion were:

1. There should be total commitment on the part of the institution to faculty involvement in college and community services. This would mean making every new faculty member aware of the aims of the particular institution.

2. Reduce faculty load to nine hours so that faculty will have time for college and community services.

3. Pay faculty extra money per hour of service.

4. Give a department of the college the responsibility of designing a program for the school which would meet community needs.

5. Have a new faculty member develop a course for less intellectual students.

6. Use the community as a laboratory as part of the classroom work.

7. Bring community resource organizations (Chamber of Commerce, Narcotic Squad) and people into the classroom to share with students their particular specialty.

8. Give seminare on special pertinent topics, ie, camping.

9. In the case of dental schools, open a clinic which would give services to the community.

A second point made which engendered lively discussion was directed toward the fact that community colleges should, from time to time, reevaluate what they are doing in terms of their stated purposes which includes the business of providing continuing education and training services. This would enable the colleges to keep quasi educational agencies from taking over their responsibilities.

Someone suggested that in attempting to provide continuing education at the community college level, caution should be the key work since community colleges cannot be all things to all people; thus open communication should be maintained with curriculum planners of the high school and four year college levels so that some articulation could be meaningfully developed.

PANEL IV

FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATIONAL PROCESSES

RICHARD A. COBB

Onondaga Community College

I am glad to be here and to talk with you about Faculty Involvement in Educational Processes with emphasis on the use of Instructional and Educational Television.

As a backdrop and pertinent to our discussion I want to give you some vital statistics about the number of Television and Radio Stations in the United States; this will give you a yardstick on the "outside" influence TV and Radio may exert on the thoughts and actions of students and teachers *before* they enter the classroom.

Broadcasting Yearbook, the respected Journal of the Broadcasting Industry, lists 7,019 broadcasting stations on the air. This figure includes Television and Radio, commercial and viewing per home per day in the United States is 6 hours and 20 minutes. Over 60% of all Amplitude Modulation (AM) radio stations are now Editorializing; taking a stand on issues. The more we think about these facts, the more we realize how important the influence of TV and Radio can be on the thoughts and actions of the audience.

James Reston, in a recent book called "The Artillery of the Press" makes this comment about Journalism:

> "We are no longer merely in the transmitting business. Actually, the mass communications of this country probably have more effect on the American mind than all the schools and universities combined, and the problem is that neither the officials who run the government, nor the officials who run the newspapers, nor the radio and television news programs, have adjusted to that fact."

In a moment I'll follow up with reasons why it is important to have comprehensive curricula in Radio and Television in certain Community and 2-year colleges.

From the outside let's go into the colleges and discuss some of the uses of the Instructional Television, always keeping in mind the careful and deliberate definitions of objectives in terms of the teaching and learning experience.

At Onondaga Community College the Dental Hygiene Department fuses TV for demonstration and direct teaching. Close ups and zoom lenses complement and supplement course content. The Dental Clinic and student patients aid in the demonstration, which are shown to students, and, at regular intervals specialists from Dental Schools and Colleges throughout the county give demonstrations to members of our county Dental Society.

Our communications Department uses audio tapes for at least one speech project per semester per student in 2 sections of the introductory speech course.

Video tape recordings are planned in the same two sections for next year.

Our Radio-TV curriculum makes constant use of audio and video closed circuit equipment in classes and laboratories and our graduates include a Traffic Director of a Miami Florida TV station; announcers in several New York State Radio Stations; Assistant-Technical Supervisor in an ETV station, and a Director of Merchandising.

In summary: Capable faculty, and good technical personnel on the full time staff are a must for effective college of television. Adequate budget, and advance planning; a cooperative process between faculty, administration and the sponsoring agency.

Testing of learning and instruction is necessary, in order that a favorable climate for creative innovation and improved instruction will exist, so that 2-year colleges take advantage of and properly use Instructional and Educational Television.

FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATIONAL PROCESSES AS IT RELATES TO RIGIDITY AND SOCIAL SCIENCE INSTRUCTION IN PROGRAMS OF TECHNICAL EDUCATION—

FRANK S. DiSTEFANO
Broome Technical Community College

Introduction

Let us commence with the simplest possible definition of "faculty involvement in educational processes." In reflecting on the ambivalent nature of the subject it could be said it encumbers all of the activities related to the accomplishment of educational objectives of a structured institution of learning. Given this definition (and assuming that it is broad enough to satisfy all one might argue that the scope is far too extensive to lend itself to brief discussion and-or presentation. It can therefore be suggested that an important advance could be made by joining more precise descriptions of environments with instructionally-based assessment of student characteristics as they relate to curriculum change.

The nature of this multi-dimensioned topic appears to lend itself to specific considerations involving authentic interest in technical students and their curriculum requirements so as to enable junior college faculty to explore the vital aspects of academic course offerings as they meaningfully relate to social change. This presentation is then predicated on the belief that faculty involvement within the context of a pragmatic frame of reference is fundamental insofar as involvement in educational processes is concerned. The subsequent effort, as follows, is then directed towards a consideration of rigidity and social science instruction in programs of technical education as a reflection of faculty involvement in educational processes.

The treatment of the social sciences in two-year programs of technical education affords the opportunity to analyze a unique and somewhat controversial phase of contemporary college instruction. The technically-oriented students view many of these programs as dull and redundant presentations enmeshed with periodic references to the need for comprehending man's behavioral patterns in preparation for "life adjustment." It follows then that developing programs, cemented together with the paste of time and the techniques of another era, are deplorable reflections of what current social science offerings in technical curricula ought to be. Conversely, it is hoped that the more conscientious will address themselves to an etiology of the failure to affect a desired pattern of educational socialization as it relates to the establishment of a relevant dialogue with the social sciences. Essentially then, this paper is an attempt to briefly explore the aspect of rigidity as it applies to the meaningful application of social sciences in technical programs of instruction.

It has been noted that the objective that frequently serves as the foundation for the teaching of any discipline is the proselytization of capable young scholars to a particular field of endeavor. This plausible goal is not applicable to the technical curricula that specialize in the preparation of the career-oriented student. The problem apparently centers about the failure of social scientists to evaluate realistically the objectives of technical programs and the type of student whose needs they serve. This student cannot be converted to the social sciences in the usual sense because he has *already* committed himself to another point of view. This precludes the usual "missionary" effort that so many disciplinarians consider important.

Philosophical consideration should be directed toward the projection of independent and dynamic approaches to social science education designed to better serve a society racing into the twenty-first century. Nowhere is there a greater recognition of the manifestation of change than in the scientifically anchored technical programs of education. There are many who are developing a painful awareness of the failure of social science education to play an adjuvant role in this undertaking.

It would seem appropriate that social scientists focus their attention on a subsequent reorganization of goals and objectives if they are to obviate the possibility of banality that oftentimes appears to dominate social science instruction. No longer can there be dependence on the mirroring of ideas whose objectives stem from such abstract goals as "teaching students how to think" or the utilizing of such vague expressions as "explaining human nature." It is essential to remember that the average technical student does not have the time, background, nor the interest to share in the phenomena of the unfolding of the social sciences. The technical student represents the newest college-age generation whose attitudes and interests reflect its upper-lower and lower-middle class background. This student's aspirations are directed by vocational and material interests sustained by limited mobility and supported by the home and the industrial economy that has nurtured him. In corroborating the above, it can be noted that a majority of these students seek and find employment within the confines of the community from whence they came.

The growing problem created by the limitation of adequate time is a situation not unique in education; yet it is pertinent in its relationship to social science offerings in technical education. Compounding this situation is the aggravation caused by the pressing problem of mandated course offerings that forces the issue of course expendability. This instinctively telescopes attention toward the present social science disciplines of economics, psychology, and especially sociology. Unsigned student questionnaires reflect a general lack of enthusiasm that at times borders on boredom. These distressing findings appear to be based on preconceived and governing attitudes that appear inherent. It is conceivable that these opinions are ordered by a trenchant lack of reasoning heightened by the presence of goals originally designed to serve the needs of baccalaureate degree candidates. The problem could be resolved by the justification of course objectives and the establishment of meaningful relationships having a focal point of interest. This would have the effect of forcing social scientists from their vacillating position into a rational posture or immediate confrontation with the possible alternative of deletion of their offerings.

The most excruciating of technical man's failures is his lack of knowledge of the society in which he lives. By offering a realistic program that emphasizes the utilization of local and community resources that relates analogous problems, the curriculum builders of technical education programs could initiate a Socratic investigation of an unexamined life. It is the shocking lack of meaningful association that prevents the social scientist from creating the desired investigation of the social structures of man as they relate to the *means* as well as the *needs* of this burgeoning new social class.

What some have construed as ambivalence regarding the preciseness of the social sciences could be corrected by consideration of the polemical aspects that constitute an essential contribution to knowledge. The strange and sometimes hostile treatment afforded the social scientist is a unique corollary. The customary treatment of the subject by staff usually reflects the traditional forms of presentation found in the baccalaureate programs and as a consequence accounts for the lack of communication and meaning that frustrates even the most herculean efforts. Failure to realize that the community college *is not* a limited edition of the four-year college and the subsequent failure to devise programs commensurate with the unique needs and backgrounds of its students affords us an interesting basis of causation.

Investigation of two-year college curricula quickly reveals that staff members are chaining themselves to the traditional academic umbilical cord of the standard textbook. The obvious result is that we find that courses of study are *not* structured on student, societal, nor community needs; rather they reflect thought patterns of professional and seemingly prolific writers. In short, the courses of study faithfully reflect chapter headings.

The situation conceivably could be rectified with the implementation of a program that stressed agreement on mundane objectives and goals. The broad spectrum of programs offered in technically-oriented institutions obviates the possibility of a panacea for all curriculum problems; yet it is safe to assume that the curricula have been tailored to meet the economic and social needs particular to a geographic region. Hence there is the possibility that mutually approved objectives and goals do indeed exist. For example, why not discuss ethnic islands of the community in question rather than rely on those of the general geographic region? In other words, gear the program so as to fully utilize community resources and situations as a means of motivating the technically-oriented student. Determine the nature of the situation that this type of student is likely to encounter, ascertain his socio-economic background and structure the offering to include these factors as a method of stimulating interest and altering preconceived values and attitudes. Motivation, it would appear, is based on recognized needs as well as interest.

The technically-oriented two-year college can and should provide programs of social science instruction designed to extend the values of general education. Programs must be developed combining the two kinds of education in appropriate proportions and making them interdependent as well as meaningful. These objectives can be facilitated by implementation of the following recommendations:

1. The existing policies of staff recruitment should be altered to reflect the importance of community awareness on the part of candidates as a contingent provision for appointment. The reference is made not only in restrictive terms of community involvement and interest; rather, what is inherent is that this recommendation is a total commitment that includes a complete and comprehensive understanding of the nature of the community and its resources. This would serve as an invaluable aid in the interactional process of teaching and learning as they relate to the personnel and regional needs. All things being equal, the obvious thrust in proselyting staff would then be directed toward those who reside within the general community. It reflects yet another schism with tradition especially in light of the proclivities of job-shopping professionals to periodically relocate.

2. The second major recommendation pertains to academic renewal and involves the restructuring of social science to meet present-day needs. Instead of offering separate and independent "tidbits" of knowledge in the form of one-term (usually quarter se-

mester length) capsules of economics, psychology, and sociology, the creativity of the social scientist should be brought to the fore. Glean what should and can be effectively taught about American society and integrate this into a flexible year-long program that is specifically designed to capture the natural interest and curiosity that is so characteristic of human nature. It calls for emphasis on realism and deals with ideas as they relate to the context of technological change. If organized with care, consideration, and a measure of planning skill, the program could serve as a springboard for student enrollment in separate areas of interest. The offering could jocularily be referred to as a smorgasbord of ideas, and this is precisely what is intended. Governing the structure of such a proposal would be the inclusion of a central overriding theme designed to provide cohesion and unity. It should be abundantly clear by now that the traditional approaches to the social sciences within technical programs are not effective since they are neither motivating nor are they educationally sound.

3. The third and final recommendation would involve changes in the style and method of instruction. The faculty should become student-orieneed in that they should develop an awareness of the subsequent needs, background, and the *anticipated* types of occupational situations the students are likely to find themselves involved with in the future. The implementation of a working dialogue with responsible staff from the office of student personnel could do much to alleviate related problems. The faculty should be encouraged to develop new and dynamic and even unconventional resources and approaches to teaching and learning. It would be quite possible to take advantage of the particular strengths of existing faculty by developing a team-teaching approach involving community experts as well as regular faculty. The establishment of meaningful and effective communication with the students should have preference over all other considerations and would no doubt obviate some of the traditional practices.

In conclusion, a renaissance of thought is a necessity as increased numbers of students stream into diverse technical programs. A technically-oriented society continues to demand increased numbers of trained and skilled personnel to satisfy the needs of an increasingly complex society. This trend is heightened by the force of social pressures of our time. Neither society nor the students are going to accept unreasoned rigidity in thought or action. The movement from the concrete to the abstract is infinitely more logical when in contrast with the broad and unrelated structure of present offerings. In retrospect, the social scientist in technically-oriened curricula should redefine their role, reassess priorities, and develop programs consistent with their expressed mission. Only then can they expect to penetrate the mainstream of technical education. In an era characterized by dynamic change, the social sciences have an opportunity to dramatize the need for programs oriented toward the particular needs and abilities of their prospective students. In essence, the social sciences can become partners in technical education rather than serving merely a perfunctory role.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aviation, Federal Agency of. *Employee Handbook*. Washington, D.C.: Federal Aviation Agency, 1965. (No author is listed; the work is designed to be used within the department.)

Brown, Ralph S. Jr. and Joughlin, Louis. "Announcement of a Program for Faculty Responsibility and Authority." *A.A.U.P. Bulletin, Vol. 53, No.* 4, December 1967, pp. 400-402.

Coleman, James S. "The Adolescent Society," *Studies in American Society,* ed. Derek L. Phillips. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1966, pp. 102-151.

Department of Child Development and Family Relationships, New York State College of Home Economics at Cornell University, Ithaca, New York: *American Families: The Impact of Social Change,* 1966.

Gould, Samuel B. "The Community College Mission," derived from a speech made to the Association of Boards and Council of the Two-Year Colleges of the State University of New York in the Fall of 1967.

Kellogg, Marion S. "New Angles in Performance Appraisal," Reprint from A.M.A. Management Report *No. 63,* American Management Association, Inc., 1961.

Maccoby, Michael. "The Cornell Introductory Course in the Social Sciences," *Harvard Educational Review,* Vol. 37, No. 3, Summer 1967, pp. 425-450.

Stodolsky, Susan S. and Lesser, Gerald. "Learning Practices in the Disadvantaged," *Harvard Educational Review,* Vol. 37, No. 4, Fall 1967, pp. 546-589.

INNOVATE OR STAGNATE

WAYNE E. SCHLIFKE
Assistant Professor
Erie County Technical Institute

As educators in the newest and most dynamic phase of education today, we bear the responsibility of achieving that which others have either been unable to or chosen not to do. The junior college student is unique in higher education. As such is it not reasonable to expect that programs and courses be designed to meet his needs and those of his ultimate employer? Is it also not logical to assume that if our role is in fact unique, perhaps our curricula ought employ what might be considered by others as unorthodox techniques? Most would undoubtedly accept these hypotheses in varying degrees. There are perhaps even some who would quite emphatically insist that they are fulfilling this role. All too frequently however, a close look at the facts reveals that the junior college program emulates that of its sister institutions in the business of higher education.

Nearly every education publication has, in recent years, offered editorials or papers critical of such institutions as lecturing, the "cookbook" technique, dead-end education, etc. In most cases, it is probably safe to assume that we are in accord with these opinions — yet we persist! Again exception may be taken and in some cases perhaps justifiably so. However, let each clearly distinguish between normal change and true innovation. More specific consideration of several areas might serve to motivate the kind of thought and discussion that should be taking place in the junior college community.

The Lecture Syndrome

Lecturing is undoubtedly the greatest of all higher education institutions. Somehow each of us has survived the educational process not as a result of the lecture — but rather in spite of it. Research has proven many times over, the ineffectiveness of lecturing. Why then is it still so prevalent? Many reasons might be offered — the engineer says it's the only way, the administrator secretly admits that it keeps the budget down and the psychologist suggests that it represents an ego-massage. The hard, cold fact, however, is that nothing is more ineffective, inefficient and downright boring to the student.

Modern technology offers a multitude of audio-visual devices and techniques proven effective in improved learning. The crux of the problem, however, remains in the hands and mind of the educator. He is the one who, through genuine concern for his students, must create such innovations and changes as required to bring about better communication in the teaching-learning process. To paraphrase — lecturing is dead!

The "Cookbook" Technique

The easiest way to teach an analytical course is to "cookbook" it. How many times is it said, "The following is a step-by-step procedure for proper solution of the problem" or "The experiment is detailed quite clearly on the laboratory procedure sheet"? If anyone need fear being replaced by a machine it is the "instructor" who conducts courses in this manner. Frequently, such an approach will be justified by reason of its classical nature or for reasons of safety in the laboratory. Granted, a certain amount of this type of training can be justified — especially in technology — but certainly it should not be the only technique.

If the goal of education is to prepare the student for a life of fulfillment, had we ought not to build courses in a manner so as to cultivate independent thought? The single most important talent we can develop within the student is the ability to reason and formulate independent judgment. Perhaps the content of our analytical courses could be more effectively communicated to the student through a series of independent exercises, experiments or projects rather than a rote sequence of activities.

Dead-End Education

Perhaps the greatest problem junior colleges have in general has to do with the closed-end nature of their curricula. It is probably fair to say that most of our students will not achieve the doctoral level. Neither though would it be valid to assume that they cannot achieve beyond the junior college. It is an accepted fact that in the world of tomorrow, training, retraining and continuing education will be a necessity for survival. Yet most junior college programs are of terminal nature with specific closed-end occupational goals. Many of our graduates do continue their education but has anyone ever stopped to consider that perhaps the technician wants simply to be a better technician and not an engineer or the computer programmer a better qualified programmer rather than a mathematics major?

Junior colleges will truly come of age when their programs become open-ended, when they offer sound programs of continuing-education and when they construct curricula to allow for the inevitable changes in the complexion of our technological society. Again, this growth must be fostered and implemented by an aware faculty.

It is not proposed that solution of these problems will solve all the educational ills of the junior colleges. Neither, does this paper propose to represent a panacea for the specific problems discussed. Rather, it is the intent that junior college faculty become cognizant of what must be done and take such steps as each is able in order that the total role of the junior college be fulfilled. By reason of its relative infancy and thus freedom from the staid traditions of academe, it enjoys the flexibility which opens the door to innovation.

FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATIONAL PROCESSES

ALFRED . SLOAN, JR.

The Fashion Institute of Technology

Few would deny that the role of the faculty, in terms of influence upon the educational process, has increased substantially in recent years — and gives every promise of developing yet further. While it would be an elongation of the truth to claim that the university teacher in America "controls" his institution to the degree that his European or British counterparts do (where the administrative function is primarily a housekeeping one and where administrators are normally responsible to their colleagues by election), it is probably fair to state that faculties today enjoy a degree of control over institutional destinies unknown, perhaps, since the days of the colonial college in America.

Rather than delineate the degree of control which has already been developed — or to attempt to assess the reasons for its recent rapid growth — it would seem to be more meaningful to try to discover what use is likely to be made of this new-found strength. For power, if not used wisely, may produce a result the very antithesis of what it was designed to achieve.

The major — and crucial — decision, it would seem, is whether the college faculty of today is prepared to take advantage of its strategic position and press for the development of an optimum educational experience for the undergraduate body. The opportunity (one is tempted to say "of a lifetime") seems to be presenting itself. The question is: will it be grasped?

By an "optimum educational experience" one refers to that usage of time and institutional resources which will most nearly fulfill the stated goals of (in our case) the junior college experience. Platitudes aside, we are all pretty much devoted to turning out a graduate knowledgeable, to some degree, of the world about him, geared to moral purposes, and, in many cases, possessed of a marketable professional skill. If such is our objective, how best can it be achieved? More immediately, what can we as faculty members — now in a position of growing substantive influence — do about it?

Would it not seem that, for a starter, every aspect of our current educational experience, curricular and otherwise, be subject to an exhaustive review? Are we, for example, asking students to undertake studies today which were meaningful in 1948 or 1958 — but not in 1968? Do our technical curriculums possess a balance between professional and liberal studies which represented *le dernier cri* a dozen years ago but which holds diminished validity today? Are we pursuing work-study programs — or television instruction — or teaching machines — because they are the "thing to do" or because we are convinced of their educational value? Are we moving into the trimester system because we wish not to be out of fashion, or are we satisfied that it represents substantial advantages over the more conventional approach to the calendar?

And what about our extra-curricular area? How many "activities" are we subsidizing with institutional time, funds, and energy because we assume them to be essential to the traditional college experience? How many students on your campus read the college newspaper? How many attend the performances of the dramatic society, or come to the "proms?" What percentage of your student body attended the last home baseball game — or tennis match? Is your student government association a meaningful representation of the student body or simply a "house union?"

It seems not unfair to say that our

institutions indulge in a great many exercises, curricular and otherwise, primarily because residential undergraduate colleges have practiced them for decades.1) But might we not look farther afield for our models? Is there not some truth in the fact that, age aside, many of our undergraduates — particularly those in technical programs — possess attitudes more in common with those of students in professional schools than in residential undergraduate colleges? Is not their training job-directed? Is not their place of residence almost always beyond the campus perimeter? Is not their basic motivation more likely to be career- than institution-oriented?

Reflection suggests that professional schools perform a sound educational function without any major extra-curricular effort and with considerable independence of approach on curricular matters. They also tend to enjoy, perhaps not incidentally, substantial faculty prestige, collective as well as individual. Might this not suggest a possible direction for our future efforts? At the very least, ought we not — in our new position as educational "influentials" — place all aspects of our institutional endeavors under continuing scrutiny and satisfy ourselves that they square with our version of what a modern two-year undergraduate education ought to offer?

As faculty members, an opportunity of great potential lies before us. Will we have the foresight to grasp it? Or will we, in the words of a nineteenth century savant, "be so bigoted to custom . . . as to worship it at the expense of truth."

---

1. Was it not Alexandre Dumas who suggested that ". . . the custom and fashion of today wll be the awkwardness and outrage of tomorrow — so arbitrary are these transient laws?"

FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATIONAL PROCESSES

DR. JOSEPH SEIDLIN
SUNY A&T, Alfred

I wonder how college faculties of, say, fifty years ago, would react to the title of our theme, "FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATIONAL PROCESSES." Analogously, how would physicians react to a discussion titled, "THE PHYSICIAN'S INVOLVEMENT IN THE TREATMENT OF SICK PEOPLE." In the language of the younger generation, they would pose the query, "What else is new?" But in fifty years or less we have succeeded in creating a dichotomy between teachers and teaching so that the title of our discussion is not only reasonable but urgently timely.

About forty years ago Princeton established research professorships, which in a sense recognized the nonteaching professorship and thus relieved some of the fine researchers from the burden of holding classes. At the time, I made an unkind remark that that was one way to raise the quality of teaching at Princeton. Since then colleges and universities — large and small, ivy and otherwise — have been exalting the professor, and demeaning his involvement in educational processes. The movement, if we can call it that, gained its initial prominence in the institutions of higher learning and then made its way infectiously into higher institutions of learning.

What about the two-year colleges? Will they also go the way of all flesh? Will they also succumb to the dictum, "If you can't lick 'em, join 'em?" As I read the State University Newsletter, the Junior College Journal, the various junior college news bulletins, I sense what I would consider putting a halo over research projects, grants, and publications on one hand, and expressing in small print or footnotes, "educational processes."

I hope that this trend, if a trend it is, is merely transitional, that it is merely to establish a status of respectability of the two-year colleges as the youngest institution in the category of higher institutions of learning. It would be a great pity if in the process of gaining academic respectability, the two-year colleges abandoned their initial objectives. It would be unfortunate if the two-year colleges emulated the "eager beavers." You probably know that a popular definition of an "eager beaver" describes him as one who, having lost sight of his objectives, redoubles his efforts.

When the panelists have had their say, I am sure that many questions bearing on the structure, purposes, objectives, and ambitions of the two-year colleges will come to light and to the scrutiny of the audience. I hope that there will be ample time for questions and comments, not only from and by the members of the panel, but also from the audience at large.

EXTEMPORANEOUS REMARKS DELIVERED AT NIAGARA FALLS, N.Y., ON "FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN COLLEGE AND COMMUNITY SERVICE"

PETER J. CAFFREY
Bronx Community College

The three papers which you heard during yesterday afternoon's session were basically concerned with the "Why?" of faculty involvement in community service. It is my purpose this morning to emphasize, by using a case history-question approach, not so much the "Why?" of faculty involvement, but rather the "How?" I will concern myself with the individual faculty member and his reactions to his responsibilities and his opportunities for community service.

Of the four cases which I will present, the first two cases involve faculty members' points of view; the third may be expressive of either a faculty member's or administrator's dilemma; and the fourth will involve the responsibilities of an administrator in community service.

Before I begin to present the cases and questions, let it be clearly understood that while these questions are stated as universals, my purpose in stating them is not to elicit universal answers, but to offer the situations as a basis for your inrospection — both personal and institutional.

CASE I: You are a young instructor with, perhaps, a year or two of college teaching experience. You are facing the usual pressures of a young instructor (e.g.: a 15 to 18 hour teaching load; internal and external pressures to produce scholarship and give evidence of growth; and even, perhaps, the economic need to "moonlight" by devoting a considerable amount of time to additional teaching and-or consulting).

QUESTION:

How do you allocate your time in order:

a. to contribute;
b. to learn;
c. to become involved with the community in terms of your needs and responsibilities and the community's needs and responsibilities?

CASE II: You are an instructor whose department head has assigned you, as part of your teaching load, a sub-college level course as part of a community service project. You feel that all of your graduate training, your skill as a college teacher, the level of excellence to which you have committed yourself when you entered college teaching are challenged. In fact, you are somewhat insulted that "the college" should have undertaken what you consider to be a non-college project.

QUESTIONS:

1. Do you rebel by attacking the key administrators and calling for their abdication or resignation?
2. Do you join a union or some other faculty organization and thereby hope to gain a voice in the acceptance and rejections of these programs?
3. Do you go back to industry, or, perhaps to a more traditionally-orientated liberal arts college whose administration refuses to get involved in such work?

CASE III: You are an instructor or administrator working in an urban setting who feels that the quality of education, the standard of living or the sociological environment is not conducive to raising your children as you feel they should be raised. You, therefore, leave the urban environment and move your family to a suburban location from which you commute to your college each day.

QUESTION: Faced with the pressures from two communities, with which community do you identify, to which community do you contribute, and with which community do you become involved?

CASE IV: You are an administrator faced with pressures from powerful political and social groups within the community which your college serves. Your administrative judgment discerns that there is a very clear need in the community for involvement, not only on a personal level, but on an institutional and professional level.

QUESTIONS:

1. Do you reply affirmatively to the pressure groups and then try to convince your colleagues in the administration and faculty of the need and the necessity for involvement?
2. Do you hold in abeyance any decision until you have consulted with key members of your administration and representatives of the faculty to sound them out about the need and the feasibility of your college becoming involved in community-orientated projects?
3. If most of your faculty refuse to participate in such projects, do you proceed on your own initiative by committing the resources of the college to such community programs?

Although I have provided no answers to these questions, I hope that some answers might suggest themself from the situations presented. I feel that basically each individual in this room must attempt to answer these questions for himself in terms of his responsibilities as a faculty member and-or administrator, and must ascertain the nature of his colleagues reactions to such questions. As I have said, there are no universal answers to these questions. Even though the questions themselves may seem to appear naive, it is my contention that no progress can be made in promoting faculty involvement in community service unless every administrator and faculty member at your college has answered these questions for himself.

I hope that the questions which I have asked will help to stimulate your discussion this morning, and I thank you for yoar attention.

RANDOM "THOUGHTS" AND REACTIONS TO THE DISCUSSIONS IN PANEL 4

JOSEPH SEIDLIN
SUNY A&T, Alfred

Unless we define our objectives carefully and specifically, we have no way of knowing whether anything we do is of value. There is an old saying, "to a mariner whose sails are not set for any port, no wind is favorable."

We hear a great deal about the lag between theory and practice. That lag has been studied and reported on in various ways and in a great many fields. However, there is the reverse lag that may be just as disturbing, but to which little attention is paid. I am referring to the lag between practice and theory. Even long after a theory has been discredited or discarded or, as we sometimes say, exploded, someone, somewhere, ignorant of the fate of this theory, either begins or continues an application in practice. Some years ago I asked the chief of internal medicine at the Mayo Clinic to what especially does he ascribe the clinic's fame. His reply was rather startling. It went something like this: Needless to say, we have gifted practitioners and technologists, unique and excellent facilities, etc. but the one thing that is especially characteristic of the Mayo Clinic is that however successful a theory has been, we waste no time in discarding the theory when a newer and better theory comes along. Not too many years ago, Time magazine devoted an inordinate amount of space to an experimental school in England; a school that was run by a man and wife who just came across G. Stanley Hall's theory of catharsis, but who obviously have not yet read or heard about William James's theories on habit. Many other examples come to mind: the champions of the non-graded school apparently have not heard or read about the Winnetka system, the Dalton plan, the Miller plan, the group study plan; all of them nearly fifty years old.

In the March, 1968, issue of the Junior College Journal, there is a one-page article submitted by a man who in all probability is himself a very effective and perhaps outstanding teacher. But no one, least of all a scientist, should use undefined words, words that are crucial to the meaning and logical consistency of a principle, a principle that clearly becomes invalid when logical consistency is ignored. In a recent article I said that among other ills afflicting present society, there may be "too much language."

In recent years we have been hearing so much about the real or spurious relationship between teaching and research. There are those who claim that every good teacher must be a researcher; at the other extreme there are those who claim that a man who is completely involved in research is ipso facto disqualified as a teacher. I believe that both of these claims are extreme and generally false. Research and teaching are not necessarily like Siamese twins nor are they mutually exclusive. If we distinguish between research and scholarship; if we assign to research the quest for new knowledge, however tiny; if we assign to scholarship the analysis, the interpretation of knowledge, old and new; then perhaps categorically we might say that every teacher, certainly at the college level, *must be a scholar*. He may or may not be a researcher. In fact, there are many distinguished researchers who are not scholars. Needless to add, if a person is at once a teacher, a scholar, and a researcher, he is the ideal.

All of us know that in the daily routine of teaching there are many almost mechanical processes. There are many activities that do not require a long, protracted, and specifically professional training. Clearly, it is desirable to free the teacher for the often neglected interaction between live persons (in this case, teachers and students). It seems to me that teachers should have an open mind toward all kinds of audio-visual and mechanical aids, even teaching machines. But a too readily unexamined, uncritical acceptance of any and every gadget that comes along may actually be detrimental to the teaching-learning process.

Finally, no teaching method or technique, or scheme — with or without the aid of gadgets — is foolproof. None has a monopoly on ineffective teaching.

Over The Years

This 1968 Conference Report is the fourth successive record of speeches, position papers and panel discussion summaries your association has published. We hope it represents a significant service to our membership.

Questions are often asked about the origin of the New York Association of Junior Colleges and its subsequent activities. With the aid of data from the files of the association's second president, Dr. Donald E. Deyo, then of Walter Hervey Junior College; and from conversations with Dr. Rollo Wicks, Chmn. Division of General Education, SUNY ATC at Canton, and Professor Paul Doyle, chairman of the English Dept., New York City Community College also former presidents your executive secretary presents the following notes.

"Isabel Phisterer, then President of Cazenovia (Junior) College was the single person who had the initial idea for the establishment of the New York State Association of Junior Colleges" writes Dr. Deyo. The idea, first expressed at 1946 Fall Regent's Convocation in Albany, became a reality in April, 1947 at a meeting of junior college presidents at Cazenovia. Miss Phisterer, Donald Deyo, and Dr. Paul Shafer, were appointed to draft a constitution and bylaws. The five institutions represented at that meeting were: Associated Colleges of Upper New York by Mr. Loring M. Thompson of Champlain College, Plattsburgh, Cazenovia Junior College by Miss Phisterer, Packer Collegiate by Dr. Shafer, Roberts Junior College by Mr. Merlin G. Smith, and Walter Hervey Junior College by Mr. Deyo.

Motivating factors included the Regents' Report on Post War Planning for Higher Education which recommended the five pilot programs of the Institutes of Applied Arts and Sciences at Brooklyn, White Plains, Binghamton, Utica, and Buffalo; the growing number of private junior colleges; needs for more educational opportunities for veterans, and the encouragement from Dr. Jesse Bogue of the American Association of Junior Colleges. Not all leaders in New York State's higher education circles agreed with the idea. Dean Harry S. Ganders of Syracuse University suggested that an informal organization might have merits initially and this plan was followed.

By late September 1947, the New York State Association of Junior Colleges had a president "ad interim" in the person of Miss Isabel Phisterer. Soon the Association was giving its reasoned support to the Owen D. Young Commission's proposals for the creation of a state university with at least one trustee who has a sympathetic understanding of the liberal and technical phases of the junior college movement. It also urged that the proposed "community colleges be truly junior colleges . . . requiring high school graduation" and offering progams of transfer quality. Early in 1948 it reaffirmed these stands and began to study its relationships to the two Associations of Higher Education in New York State.

The support of the idea of granting Associate degrees, the improvement of junior and senior college transfer relationships, and opposition to the Veteran's Administration's virtual discontinuance of education and training sections occupied the Association's leaders in the Spring of 1948. By that Fall the Association was studying seriously the idea of granting "some sort of a degree for the successful completion of two years of college work". At the October 14, 1948 annual conference in Albany twenty-three persons representing seven private, eight public two year colleges and five State Education Department offices discussed problems relating to degrees, orientation of high school guidance personnel and a full slate of officers was elected. Miss Phisterer became President, Miss Courtney Carroll, President of Bennett Junior College, Vice-president; Mr. Merlin G. Smith, President of Roberts Junior College, Secretary-Treasurer; and Mr. Loring M. Thompson, Director.

In 1949 attention focused on background for junior college teaching, work-study programs, kinds of degrees appropriate for junior colleges, and objectives and programs of junior colleges in New York State. The question of granting degrees was the most absorbing one and one survey seemed to indicate that few public or private junior colleges or technical institutes were strongly in favor of the idea. However, NYSAJC members were strongly in favor of the proposal. The officers elected as the annual meeting were: President, Donald E. Deyo; Vice President, Paul B. Richardson of Utica Institute of Applied Arts and Sciences; Secretary-Treasurer, Mrs. Harriet Cook, Dean of Cazenovia Junior College; Director, Dr. Frederick A. Morse, President of ACUNY.

Vigorous efforts to persuade the Board of Regents to approve the granting of the Associate degree continued in 1950. When specific proposals for the Associate in Arts (AA) and Associate in Applied Science (AAS) degrees were formulated by the Office for Higher Education, New York's junior colleges could not agree quickly to accept the proposal although all wanted this state to be in line with the others. Letters in the files indicate that our Association President's "energetic leadership" greatly assisted in bringing action in this area. He also renewed efforts to secure the cooperation of all junior colleges and technical institutes in the activities of the State Association and succeeded in bringing the membership to twelve of the twenty-four junior colleges in the state. The policies of alternating the presidency between representatives of private and public junior colleges and of the expected succession of the vice-president to the presidency were suggested by outgoing President Deyo. These policies are still in operation and the former is mandated by the 1962 constitution.

The 1951 year, under the leadership of President Paul Richardson, Director of Utica Institute; Vice-President, Harriett Cook, Dean of Cazenovia Junior College; Secretary-Treasurer, Father Casian Kirk, Dean, St. Joseph's Seraphic Seminary; and Executive committeeman Louis A. Rice, President of Packard Junior College, saw much attention being given to the development of better means of communication among NYSAJC members. To assist in this effort Mr. Robert Davidson, instructor at Farmingdale Institute and Mr. Paul Doyle of N.Y.C. Institute of Applied Arts and Sciences began editing a quarterly *News Bulletin* which was published in an attractive format at the Utica Institute. The growth in individual memberships caused concern among some administrators lest the focus of NYSAJC be changed. A committee was created to propose suitable changes in the By-laws.

(Our files are incomplete for the years 1952, 53 and we would appreciate aid in locating accounts of the activities of these years.)

By 1954 under the presidency of Dr. Charles W. Laffin Jr., then of N.Y.C. Institute of Applied Arts and Sciences the Constitution was changed to provide for the creation of a Faculty Council to encourage the active participation of classroom teachers in Association activities. Dr. Howell Pickett of Paul Smith's Junior College, Mrs. Mary Jones of Fashion Institute of Technology, and Father Peter Hogan of Epiphany Apostolic Seminary were among the first officers of the Faculty Council. In its eight years of operation this group conducted many stimulating discussions of professional problems.

When the American Association of Junior Colleges came to New York City for its annual convention, the NYSAJC under the presidency of Dr. Chester Burton of Paul Smith's College, were the honored hosts in 1956 with the aid of the Junior College Council of the Middle Atlantic States.

"In recent years the members of our state association have been very active in the Junior College Council of the Middle Atlantic States. Four presidents of our association have been elected president of the latter organization. These are Isabel Phisterer, of Cazenovia Junior College; Chester Buxton, of Paul Smith's College; Charles Laffin, Jr., of Farmingdale; and Rollo Wicks, of the Agricultural and Technical Institute at Canton.

"Moreover, in the past ten years three of our colleges have played host to the Junior Colleges Council of the Middle Atlantic States for its annual June workshops. These are: Farmingdale in 1953, Paul Smith's in 1954, 1961, and 1968, and Bennett in 1962.

"More recently, our people have also become very active in the programs of the American Association of Junior Colleges, several of them serving on its commissions, and in 1967-68 Donald A. Eldridge of Bennett College served as President of A.A.J.C. Among AAJC's Board and Commission members have been Lawrence Bethel, Walton H. Brown, Rhea M. Eckel, Charles W. Laffin, Jr., and Philip C. Martin.

The Association through its officers and its executive committee has worked with the Division of Higher Education of the State Education Dept. in getting approval of the Associate in Science degree. It has stressed with the Board of Regents and Commissioner of Education James E. Allen the need for special Regent's Scholarships for outstanding graduates of two-year colleges and is active in advancing the benefits to two-year college students which state and federal programs make available to higher education institutions. We are currently urging the extension of the N.Y. Scholar Incentive Program to *all* N.Y.S. residents attending an accredited college in the state. The Association went on record at its 1968 conference also to urge that high priority be given to the development of accommodations at the upper-division level for graduates of two-year programs.

Constitution of New York State Association of Junior Colleges

I. NAME

The name of this organization shall be THE NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OF JUNIOR COLLEGES.

II. PURPOSES

1. To promote a better understanding and greater knowledge of junior colleges.

2. To strengthen the cause of the junior colleges in the state by presenting their united opinion to appropriate government agencies.

3. To improve the articulation with other colleges and secondary schools.

4. To stimulate the professional development of the membership.

5. To advance the status, prestige, and welfare of the membership.

III. OFFICERS

There shall be a President, Vice-President, and Secretary-Treasurer to serve for a term of one year. An Executive Secretary shall be appointed by the Executive Committee.

IV. DUTIES OF OFFICERS

1. The President shall plan and direct the activities of the Association and perform all duties generally pertaining to that office. He shall serve as chairman of the Executive Committee.

2. The Vice-President shall coordinate the program of the annual meeting, publicity, and public relations. He shall advise and consult with the editor of the Association Newsletter. He shall act for the President in the absence of the latter.

3. The Secretary-Treasurer shall be responsible for all records and funds of the Association and for issuing an annual financial report.

4. The Executive Secretary shall carry out plans as assigned by the Executive Committee.

V. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

1. The Executive Committee shall consist of the officers of the Association, the immediate past president serving in an advisory capacity, and ten additional members. Of the ten additional members, at least five shall be teaching faculty members.

2. The Executive Committee shall represent both public and private colleges of the state.

3. Executive Committee members will normally be elected to serve for two years, with (5) five members completing their terms each year.

VI. STANDING COMMITTEES

There shall be standing committees appointed by the President to carry out the purposes of the Association.

VII. NOMINATING COMMITTEE

There shall be a Nominating Committee appointed by the President upon his accession to office whose duties shall be to propose candidates for elective office and Executive Committee members. Report of the Nominating Committee shall be presented to the membership at least one month preceding the conference.

VIII. MEMBERSHIP

Institutional: Membership shall be opened to those institutions classified as JUNIOR COLLEGES by the New

York State Education Department upon payment of the fees established by the Executive Committee.

Individual: Any educator or person in sympathy with Junior College education may, upon payment of fees established by the Executive Committee, become a member of the Association.

IX. ELECTIONS

Officers and members of the Executive Committee shall be elected by the membership in attendance at the Annual Meeting. New officers shall take office immediately following the Annual Meeting and shall hold office until the next election. Candidates for all elective offices shall be members of the Association.

X. VOTING PRIVILEGES

Voting Privileges shall be extended to each member in attendance at the annual conference.

XI. AMENDMENTS

Amendments to the By-laws shall be proposed to the Executive Committee at least thirty days before the annual Association meeting. Any proposed amendment must be signed by at least five members of the Association. The secretary shall send a notice of the proposed amendments to the members of the Association at least two weeks prior to the annual meeting. Amendments to the By-laws shall be voted upon at the annual Association meeting.

* * *

Adopted unanimously at the annual Association meeting, April 28, 1962.

Article V was amended to its present form at the 1965 annual meeting.

* * *

Membership Fees established for 1969
Institutional Membership

Enrollment up to 999 F.T.E. Students	$35.00
Enrollment 1000 to 1499 F.T.E. Students	45.00
Enrollment 1500 and over F.T.E Students	60.00
Individual Membership	$ 4.00